
Iowa Juvenile Court Services Workload Formula Project

Final Report

PROJECT STAFF

Suzanne Tallarico, M.A. and John Douglas

**COURT CONSULTING DIVISION | NATIONAL CENTER FOR STATE
COURTS**

July 2018



Iowa Juvenile Court Services Workload Formula Project

PROJECT STAFF

Suzanne Tallarico, M.A. and John Douglas.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR STATE COURTS

July 2018

PRESIDENT

Mary Campbell McQueen

VICE PRESIDENT, COURT CONSULTING DIVISION

Daniel J. Hall



To promote the rule of law and to improve the administration of justice in the state courts and courts around the world.

*707 Seventeenth Street, Suite 2900
Denver, Colorado 80202*

Acknowledgements

This report is the culmination of a collaborative effort between staff at the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) the Iowa Juvenile Court Services Workload Formula Committee. We extend our sincere gratitude to John Goerdts, Deputy State Court Administrator, for coordinating meetings, schedules and a host of other work for the juvenile court services employees, the Workload Formula Committee and the NCSC project team. We also would like to thank all of the committee members for their ongoing attention to the details of this project and their input; their hard work helped to ensure the quality of this study.

Finally, we extend a special thanks to all of the juvenile court staff who tirelessly tracked their time, while also attending to their important work, as well as those who took time out of their busy schedules, and in many cases, drove many miles to generously share their views, experiences, and insights during the focus groups held in February.

Workload Formula Committee Members:

Terrance Campbell, JCO III, 1st District
Michele Olthoff, JCO IV, 2nd District
David Schmiedt, JCO IV, 3rd District
Mindy Orme, JCO II, 4th District
Whitney Buchanan, JCO II, 5th District
Chris Arenas, JCO III, 6th District
David H. Tristan, JCO III, 7th District
Julie Schulthies, JCO III, 8th District
Shirley Faircloth, Chief JCO, 2nd District
Tim Ross, Chief JCO, 4th District
Kathy Gaylord, DCA, 7th District
Hon. Colin Witt, District Assoc. Judge, 5th District
Hon. Deborah Minot, District Assoc. Judge, 6th District
Kile Beisner, Sr. Research Analyst, CJJP
Scott Ruhnke, SCA Liaison to District Courts
John Goerdts, Deputy State Court Administrator, SCA

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	ii
Overview	ii
Methodology	iii
Findings	iii
Recommendations	v
I. Introduction	1
II. Overview: Theory and National Context of Weighted Caseload Assessment	2
III. Methodology	3
Work-Time Study	4
Data Elements	5
Case Status Types and Activities	5
Non-Case-Related Activities	5
IV. Determining JCOs’ Available Time for Case-Related Work	6
V. Iowa Juvenile Court Officer Time Study and Workload Values	8
Workload Values	8
VI. Qualitative Assessment of Workload Values	11
Adequacy of Time Survey	12
Focus Groups	14
Focus Group Themes	14
Focus Groups Summary	18
VII. Juvenile Court Officer Workload Calculation and Support Staff Needs	19
Determining the Need for JCOs	20
Determining the Need for Juvenile Court Specialist Staff	22
Qualitative Factors Affecting the Determination of Staffing Needs	23
VIII. Keeping the Workload Assessment Model Current and Future Use of the Model	24
IX. Recommendations	24
Appendices	27
Appendix A:	28
Iowa Juvenile Court Services Workload Study Case Status Types and Activities	28
Appendix B:	30
Iowa Juvenile Court Services Workload Study Non-Case-Related Activities	30
Appendix C:	31
Adequacy of Time Survey Findings	31
Appendix D:	42
Iowa JCS Weighted Case Formula for Determining Statewide Need for JCOs	42
Appendix E: Formula for Allocating the Statewide Need for JCO Positions (in Appdx D), Formula for JCS Support Staff, and a Summary of the Overall Statewide Need for JCS Staff.....	44

Executive Summary

Overview

In Iowa's juvenile court system, Juvenile Court Services (JCS) staff are responsible for screening youth referred to the juvenile courts from law enforcement agencies and schools. Juvenile Court Officers (JCOs) meet with youth to learn about their background and, by using a standard Iowa Delinquency Assessment (IDA) tool, determine their risk to the community and their social and educational needs. In almost two-thirds of these cases, JCOs informally resolve the issues in the delinquency referral without seeking further involvement in juvenile court. When youth move on for adjudication by the juvenile court, JCOs are responsible for supervising them based on their identified level of risk and addressing their criminogenic needs in an effort to prevent further entrenchment into the justice system.

To effectively achieve these goals JCOs and their support staff must be well-trained and have reasonable caseloads that allow them to manage the youth they supervise in a manner that supports the pro-social behavior and skill development that enable probationers to end their periods of juvenile court supervision in a pro-social manner. Excessive caseloads among JCOs jeopardize both public safety and the quality of supervision provided to youth under their supervision in Iowa. Therefore, it is imperative that the Iowa judicial branch, which employs and supervises JCS staff, be able to assess accurately the need for JCS staff and to obtain the resources to fund those positions.

Since 2004, Iowa's office of State Court Administration (SCA) has relied on a formula that determines the need for JCOs on the youth population in the state and allocates that number of JCOs among the eight judicial districts based on youth population and child poverty rates. Since then, the youth population in Iowa has declined – so the formula has indicated a decline in the demand for JCOs, but JCS efforts to comply with national best practice standards in the field have substantially increased work demands, especially for youth identified as high risk and high need. Consequently, there are concerns about the validity of the 2004 staffing formula. To address the need for a new JCS staffing formula, SCA contracted with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to develop weighted caseload formula that takes into account all of the activities for which JCS personnel are responsible.

SCA selected the NCSC to conduct the JCS workload assessment and recommend a new staffing formula for JCS staff because NCSC consultants have conducted workload assessment studies and have developed workload formulas for courts, juvenile probation offices, and other justice system agencies since the 1980s. NCSC consultants have conducted three such studies for judges in Iowa (2001, 2008, and 2016) and one for clerks and court support staff (2016).

The SCA appointed a JCS Workload Formula Committee (hereafter, committee) to assist NCSC consultants with this project. The committee included: eight juvenile court officers (JCOs) -- one from each judicial district), two chief juvenile court officers, a

district court administrator, two district associate judges and the senior research analyst from Iowa’s Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning (CJJP). The NCSC consultants, with guidance from the committee, designed and conducted a study to produce a weighted caseload formula to determine the need for JCOs and JCS staff.

Methodology

With assistance from the committee, the NCSC consultants designed and conducted a workload study that collected three types of data:

- (1) Actual work-time data recorded by JCS staff statewide during a one-month period in the fall of 2017;
- (2) A survey of all JCS staff requesting their assessment of the extent to which they have adequate time to perform their duties in a timely and high quality manner; and
- (3) Qualitative feedback from focus group discussions with 12 to 15 juvenile court staff in each of four locations (Waterloo, Washington, Des Moines, and Onawa).

The most important component of the workload assessment study was the collection of work-time data over a one-month period between October 2 and November 1, 2017. JCS staff kept track of the amount of case-related time they spent on each of 15 different case status categories and on the time they spent on noncase-related work. An impressive *100 percent* of the JCS staff in Iowa participated in the study, thereby enhancing the credibility of the data.¹

¹ There were several vacancies during the work-time study; these positions were not included in the expected number of participants.

Findings

Workload Values

Based on the work-time data collected by JCOs during the one-month study, NCSC staff estimated the annual case-related work time spent by JCOs on each of 15 different case status types (see Figure ES-1, below), and used that figure to determine the average annual amount of time spent per year on each case status type. The average annual time spent per case status type is the case type’s *workload value (or case weight)* for each case type. The workload values are the heart of a weighted caseload staffing formula. Multiplying the workload values by the number of new cases of each of the 15 case status types – and summing the results of those calculations -- produces a measure of case-specific workload (in minutes) for JCOs. That calculation provides a basis for determining the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) JCOs needed *statewide (see Appendix D)*.

Committee members reviewed the workload values for each of the 15 case status types in March 2018. They noted that the workload values were consistent with what JCS staff expected: the case status types that require the least amount of JCO time had the lowest workload values, while the case status types that require the most JCO time had the largest workload values. Committee members also reviewed the findings from the “adequacy of time survey” and feedback from the four focus groups – and they discussed whether the qualitative feedback from the survey or focus groups

justified supplementing the data-based workload values derived from the work-time study, but they declined to recommend such adjustments. Figure ES-1 shows the final JCO workload values.

Figure ES 1: Final Juvenile Court Officer Workload Values

Case Status Types	Annual Workload Value (minutes)
Intake/referral	296
Hold open status	53
Diversion	41
Interstate compact	1,362
Pending adjudication	5,431
Informal - unknown risk	251
Informal - low risk	345
Informal - moderate risk	929
Informal - high risk	1,332
Formal - unknown risk	559
Formal - low risk	1,297
Formal - moderate risk	2,999
Formal - high risk	7,821
Formal - sex offender	4,771
Waivers/reverse waivers	925

Calculation of Staffing Needs

To determine the need for JCO positions, the NCSC multiplies the JCO workload values by the number of youth in each case type category during the previous year. The sum of these calculations provides an estimate of the annual number of minutes of *case-related* work by JCOs statewide and by district.² Overall, the committee concluded that the weighted

caseload formula produced a reasonable estimate of the need for JCOs statewide.

However, during the committee’s last in-person meeting in March 2018, the committee noted that there appeared to be some anomalies or inconsistencies among the districts in the number of cases reported for some case types. Some districts had more cases than expected and some had less. The committee concluded that these anomalies were due to inconsistencies among the districts in the way JCS staff counted and entered data for the case status types. These differences produced some unexpected estimates regarding the need for JCOs. The initial weighted caseload analysis indicated some districts needed more JCOs than committee members expected while other districts needed fewer than expected. To address this concern, the committee recommends using the new weighted caseload formula to determine the *statewide* need for JCO positions (see Appendix D), but to allocate those positions using the youth population and youth poverty rate in each district to *allocate* the JCO positions *among the districts*. (See Appendix E.)

Figure ES-2 shows the number of JCO positions needed according to the new weighted caseload formula versus the current number of JCO positions filled in each district. According to the new weighted caseload formula, there is a statewide need for 206.9 full-time equivalent (FTE) JCO positions, but there are currently only 175 JCO positions filled. Consequently, there is a

² Section III of this report provides a detailed explanation of the weighted caseload calculations for determining the need for JCOs.

need for almost **32 additional JCO positions** statewide – including the 18 positions that are currently vacant.

Figure ES 2: JCO Positions Filled vs. JCOs Needed Based on New Formula*

District	A # JCOs Authorized	B # Current JCO Vacancies	C # of Filled JCO Positions	D JCOs Needed by New Formula	E Difference Between # Filled and # Needed [C-D]
1	21	-3	18	23.9	-5.9
2	26	-4	22	27.8	-5.8
3	24	-2	22	23.0	-1.0
4	12	0	12	12.7	-0.7
5	50	-4	46	53.6	-7.6
6	24	-1	23	27.2	-4.2
7	19	-2	17	21.0	-4.0
8	17	-2	15	17.7	-2.7
State	193	-18	175	206.9	-31.9

*The new weighted caseload formula (Appendix D) is used to determine the *statewide need* for JCOs (206.9 FTEs); the new *allocation formula* (Appendix E) determines the allocation of the 206.9 FTEs among the districts (column D).

Juvenile court specialists (JC specialists) and administrative assistants also participated in the work-time study. The initial hope was to develop workload values for these classes of staff as well as for JCOs. However, the data indicated that they spend a relatively small amount of their time on direct case supervision activities, so developing case-related work time values and a weighted caseload formula for determining the need for these types of staff seemed inappropriate. Instead, the committee recommends that SCA continue to use ratio-based formulas for JC specialists (one for every four authorized JCO positions) and administrative assistants (one for every Chief JCO). Figure ES-3 shows: the current number of JCOs (column A), the number of JC specialists needed according to the four-

to-one formula (column B), the number of currently *authorized* JC specialist positions (column C), and the number of *filled* positions (column D). According to column E, there are **5.2 fewer** JC specialist positions *filled* statewide than the four-to-one formula indicates the districts should have. Overall, this shortage combined with the need for **32 additional JCO positions**, indicates that Iowa’s JCS division is significantly understaffed.

Figure ES 3: JC Specialist Positions -- Formula vs Filled Positions

District	A JCOs Authorized	B JC Specialists Needed by Formula (A/4)	C Current # of JC Specialists Authorized	D Current JC Specialist Positions Filled	E # Filled is above (+) or below (-) Formula (D-B)
1	21	5.3	6.4	5.8	0.6
2	26	6.5	7.0	4.0	-2.5
3	24	6.0	5.7	5.7	-0.3
4	12	3.0	3.2	3.0	0.0
5	50	12.5	13.6	13.6	1.1
6	24	6.0	6.6	3.0	-3.0
7	19	4.8	5.0	4.0	-0.8
8	17	4.3	5.0	3.0	-1.3
State Total	193	48.3	52.5	42.1	-6.2

Continuing to operate with these staff shortages poses a substantial impediment to the full implementation of evidence-based practices that lead to effective behavior change and decreased entrenchment of youth in the justice system. It could also be detrimental to community safety.

Recommendations

The NCSC joins with the committee to offer the first six recommendations, and the NCSC offers four additional recommendations of its own.

Joint Recommendations:

1. SCA should give high priority to filling at least the current 18 JCO vacancies as soon as possible -- especially in light of the finding that there is a need for 14 additional JCOs statewide beyond those vacancies (see Figure ES-2). Committee members feel strongly that *the staffing deficit is urgent* and prohibits JCOs from attending to the needs of youth under their supervision. Without adequate staffing, more youth supervised by JCS could transition into the adult justice system. In addition, as soon as it is financially feasible to do so, SCA should fully staff JCS up to effective staffing levels, as determined by the workload assessment formula.
2. SCA should use the weighted caseload formula (see Appendix D) to determine the *statewide* need for JCO positions, and should adopt the formula in Appendix E for allocating those JCO positions among the districts.
3. The Chief JCOs should work toward achieving standardization and consistency in case status type definitions and data entry for case counts in the near future. Consistency in case coding and case counting will enhance confidence in the case counts and the staffing formula.
4. SCA should consider hiring a data analyst who focuses solely on the juvenile court system.³ Such a position
5. Three of the eight judicial districts maintain juvenile drug courts, which require staff to coordinate the program as well as JCOs who dedicate significant amounts of time to supervise youth placed in these specialized court programs. Data limitations prevented the NCSC from developing a workload value for these problem-solving courts. SCA and JCOs should develop a mechanism to track these cases in the case management system to be able to account for the number of youth in these programs. Best practices in problem-solving courts include, among other things, tracking success rates of problem-solving court participants. Having the ability to count these cases is critical to implementing this best practice standard.
6. SCA should maintain the current ratio of one juvenile court specialist for every four JCOs (1:4) and one

would be responsible for collecting and analyzing data specific for JCS and providing necessary feedback to Chief JCOs, SCA, the supreme court, and other state agencies regarding JCS caseloads and performance.

³ JCS has relied on data analysis and support from the executive branch's Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning for a very long time. The Chief JCOs and others in the judicial branch are becoming more reliant on data for planning and performance management. Relying solely on this executive branch

agency, which faces staffing constraints of its own, could limit the amount of support JCS needs to operate effectively and engage in efforts to implement best practices.

administrative assistant for each district.^{4 5}

NCSC Recommendations:

7. SCA should update the weighted caseload formula annually, using the number of new cases filed for the 15 case status types during the most recent calendar year or the average number of filings over the most recent two or three years.
8. SCA should update the workload values in this weighted caseload model every five to seven years by conducting a statewide study of the work-time of JCOs. This is the only way to ensure the workload values accurately reflect the nature and complexity of the workload and evolving practices and juvenile court technology across the state.
9. SCA should consider establishing *minimum staffing levels in each JCS office location*. Consider staffing every office with at least two employees, perhaps a JCO and a juvenile court specialist to allow the office to remain

open during regular working hours. This would also free up the JCO to engage in field visits while leaving the office open for people to check in and/or drop off information.

10. JCOs who supervise youth in drug courts carry smaller caseloads than the average JCO because youth in drug courts require more supervision.⁶ Because this study was unable to develop a workload value (weight) for drug court cases, the weighted caseload formula probably underestimates somewhat the need for JCOs in those districts. SCA should consider this when determining JCO staffing needs in those districts.

⁴ The Chief JCOs in 7 of the 8 judicial districts have 1 administrative assistant (AA), while there are 2 AAs in District 8. District 8 covers 14 counties, but District 2 includes 22 counties and Districts 3 and 5 have 16 counties each.

⁵ Each district also has one contract administrator. These positions are paid for with graduated sanctions funds obtained from the Department of Human Services. They did not participate in the work-time study for this project and are not accounted for in the

weighted case formula. If graduated sanctions funds are reduced in the future, the judicial branch will need to fund these positions to fulfill the duties performed by the contract administrators.

⁶ There is one juvenile drug court in each of six counties: Cerro Gordo (2A), Marshall (2B), Clay (3A), Plymouth (3B), Woodbury (3B), and Wapello (8A); and two juvenile drug courts in Polk County (5C) – one for boys and one for girls.

I. Introduction

Nationally, probation leaders face continual challenges of effectively managing rising caseloads, limited staff, and increasing supervision requirements and expectations. The American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) has tried for years to develop national standards for caseload sizes, but has been unsuccessful because of the vast variation in state and local investigation and supervision practices. Even so, the APPA recognizes the need for developing national standards as guidelines, but strongly endorses the need for states to determine local workloads based on carefully conducted time studies (Burrell, 2006; Pappozzi and Hinzman, 2005; Jalbert, De-Long, Kane and Rhodes, 2011). In a joint BJA-APPA publication in 2011, the authors describe the varied benefits of conducting work-time studies, from making funding requests based on empirical findings to identifying areas for improving efficiencies and effectiveness to assisting in the development of guidelines in performance evaluations (DeMichele, Payne and Matz, 2011). In response to these multiple and sometimes conflicting challenges and problems, state probation leaders have adopted methodologies that are quantitatively more sophisticated to assess probation resource needs.

Two constant and recurring problems are inherent with these challenges: (1) objectively assessing the number of probation officers (called juvenile court officers in Iowa) and support staff required to handle current and future caseloads, and (2) deciding whether probation resources are being allocated geographically according to

need. Assessing the probation workload through the development of a weighted workload formula model is a rational, credible, and practical method for meeting these objectives and determining the need for probation staff.

The focus of this study is the workload of the Juvenile Court Services (JCS) component of the Iowa judicial branch. In Iowa and other states, “The juvenile court is a specialized court that has authority over certain cases involving the lives of children” (<https://www.iowacourts.gov/iowa-courts/juvenile-court/>.) JCS staff performs intake assessments and supervision duties involving juvenile delinquency cases, defined as those acts that, if committed by an adult, would be considered criminal acts.

Since 2004, Iowa’s office of State Court Administration (SCA) has determined the *need* for JCOs using a youth *population-based* formula (one JCO for every 2,816 youth in the state). SCA has allocated those JCO among the districts using a formula that gives 80% weight to the youth population in the district and 20% weight to the youth poverty rate in the district. Neither *caseload* nor a measure of *workload* has been a factor in that formula. Since 2004 the youth population in Iowa has declined – which has decreased the estimate of the number of JCOs needed. However, JCS staff has increasingly engaged in efforts to comply with national best practice standards in the field – which has substantially increased work demands. These two conflicting trends have raised serious questions about the validity of the population-based formula.

Given the concerns about the inadequacy of the 2004 formula, Iowa’s SCA

contracted with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) in 2017 to develop a new weighted *caseload* formula to determine JCS staffing needs. The NCSC has conducted workload assessment studies since the 1980s in many states across a variety of disciplines, including judges, court staff, probation officers and parole officers. The NCSC has conducted four workload formula studies for the Iowa judicial branch: three judicial workload formula studies (2001, 2008, and 2016) and one for clerk and court support staff (2016).

To assist the NCSC with this project, the SCA appointed a JCS Workload Formula Committee (hereafter, committee). The committee included: eight juvenile court officers (JCOs) -- one from each judicial district), two chief juvenile court officers, a district court administrator, two district associate judges and the senior research analyst from Iowa's Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning (CJJP). The NCSC consultants met in-person three times with the committee and met multiple times via conference call. The committee played a critical role in designing the work-time study and in reviewing and revising this final report.

The current study developed *workload* values for each of the 15 case status types that JCS oversees. A workload value (sometimes called a case weight) is defined as the average amount of time it takes to complete the work associated with a particular case status type (e.g., intake, diversions, supervision of moderate risk youth, supervision of high risk youth, etc.). The NCSC computes workload values based upon the average number of minutes it takes to complete tasks associated with each

designated case status type. Multiplying the workload values by the number of youth served in each of those case status categories during the previous year provides a solid evidence-based means for determining the *workload* for JCOs in the state.

Specifically, the current study accomplished the following objectives:

- Utilized a methodology that bases the workload values (case weights) on all work recorded by all JCOs;
- Achieved a 100 percent participation rate by JCOs, thereby enhancing the credibility and validity of the data;
- Included a four-week data collection period to ensure sufficient data to develop valid workload values;
- Accounted for JCO work for all phases of case processing;
- Accounted for non-case-related activities that are a normal part of JCO work;
- Accounted for variations by district in JCO travel time; and
- Established a transparent and flexible formula that can determine the need for JCOs in each district.

II. Overview: Theory and National Context of Weighted Caseload Assessment

The NCSC has conducted workload assessment studies since the 1980s. These studies aim at assisting states in developing meaningful, easily understood criteria for determining overall staffing needs, taking into account both case-related and non-case-

related work-time. In all, the NCSC has conducted more than 85 workload and staffing assessments in the last ten years in a variety of contexts, including statewide and local efforts, and general and limited jurisdiction courts. These studies have involved judges, quasi-judicial officers, administrative and clerical staff, court clerks, public defenders and probation and parole officers. All of these studies produced a “weighted caseload” model that directly measures the variations in time required to manage different categories of case types within the appropriate context.⁷

Population-based staffing formulas, like the one on which Iowa has relied for determining the need for JCOs since 2004, provide only an indirect means for estimating workload. As an alternative, some jurisdictions base staffing formulas on the total number of filings in a jurisdiction. The underlying assumption of these formulas is that the caseload composition in all jurisdictions within a state are approximately the same, which is almost certainly not the case. Rather, case types and caseloads vary in complexity, and different types of cases require different levels of attention from JCS staff.

A weighted caseload formula develops workload values (weights) for each key case type to account for this variation in case status types. By weighting each case status type, a weighted caseload formula more accurately assesses the amount of time required to supervise and manage the workload.

Jurisdictions that adopt weighted caseload formulas for determining staffing needs seek an evidence-based methodology to justify their requests for resources that are essential to the effective management of cases, delivering quality service to the public and maintaining public safety. Meeting these challenges in Iowa involves the objective assessment of the number of JCS staff needed to achieve their mission and objectives.

This report provides details on the Iowa JCS Workload Formula Project methodology and explains the workload assessment formula for JCS staffing needs. The findings from the present study can be used to assist SCA in determining the need for JCS staff in each district.

III. Methodology

The NCSC worked with the JCS Workload Formula Committee, consisting of juvenile court officers, chief juvenile court officers, a district administrator, judges, a data analyst and representatives from the State Court Administrator’s Office. (The *Acknowledgements* page of this report lists the names of the committee members.)

With the committee’s help and leadership, the NCSC developed and carried out the critical components of the study. Specifically, the committee provided advice and commentary on the overall study design, the identification of case status types, the duration of the time study, the approach, and

⁷ See Douglas, John. *Examination of NCSC Workload Assessment Projects and Methodology: 1996-2006*, March 2007 for a detailed description of weighted

workload studies conducted by the NCSC between 1996 and 2006.

reviewed and signed off on the workload values prior to the completion of the project.

This workload assessment study included the collection of three types of data:

(1) Actual work-time data recorded by all JCS staff statewide during a one-month period in the fall of 2017 (100 percent of JCS staff participated in the work-time study);

(2) A survey of all JCS staff requesting their assessment of the extent to which they have adequate time to perform their duties in a timely and high quality manner; and

(3) Qualitative feedback from focus group discussions with 12 to 15 juvenile court staff in each of four locations (Waterloo, Washington, Des Moines, and Onawa).

The core of the workload assessment was the work-time study wherein JCS staff kept track of the amount of time they spent working on the various case status types (see Figure 1, below), as well as on non-case-related activities such as work-related travel, meetings, committee work, and public outreach.

The workload value (case weight) for each case type represents the average annual amount of time (in minutes) JCOs work on each case status type. Multiplying the workload values by the number of new cases within each case status type in the previous year (or the average of the previous two or three years) produces a measure of case-specific workload for JCOs, which allowed the NCSC to determine the total number of JCOs needed statewide. However, the committee raised some concerns about inconsistencies among the districts in the way they code and

count various case status categories. These differences appeared to cause some concerns about the *allocation* of the JCO positions among the districts. After discussion of alternative strategies for allocating JCO positions among the districts, the committee recommended using the weighted caseload formula only for determining the *statewide need* for JCOs (see Appendix D); and it recommended *allocating those JCO positions* among the districts through the use of the youth population and youth poverty rate formula previously employed by SCA (see Appendix E).

Work-Time Study

The NCSC staff conducted a work-time study to measure the time JCS spent processing cases.⁸ To prepare participants for the study, NCSC staff conducted 12 training sessions via webinar over a two-week period in early September 2017. During the webinars, participants learned the purpose of the study, how to record work time, and how to use the NCSC's electronic data entry site. Additionally, NCSC staff provided written instructions for all participants. Finally, the NCSC maintained a "help desk" that was available during working hours Monday through Friday of each week during the time study, and an electronic notification system used to identify data corrections that needed to be made, which was available 24/7. JCS staff could call or email the Help Desk with questions regarding how to record time.

During the one-month period between October 2 and November 1, 2018

⁸ In Iowa, administrative staff and juvenile court specialists sometimes perform juvenile court officer work. For this reason, all juvenile court staff

participated in this study, recording their work as juvenile court officer work, juvenile court specialist work or administrative staff work.

100 percent of 231 JCS staff working at the time participated in the work-time study.⁹ JCS staff recorded their time on a paper time-tracking form, and then transferred that information to a secure web-based data entry program developed and maintained by the NCSC specifically for the Iowa JCS workload study. Once submitted, the data were automatically entered into NCSC’s secure database.

Data Elements

NCSC project staff met with the committee three times in person and multiple times by conference call between July 2017 and April 2018.¹⁰ During the initial meeting, the committee and NCSC consultants identified the 15 case type categories and activity types to be included in the study, as well as determined such details as the duration and timing of the study.

Case Status Types and Activities

Figure 1 shows the 15 case status categories and case-related activity types for which JCS staff members tracked and counted their case-related work time during the study period. Appendix A provides a full explanation of these case status categories.

Figure 1: Iowa Juvenile Court Officer Workload Assessment Study Case Status Types and Activities¹¹

Case Status Types	Case-Related Activities
Intake/referral	Intake/referral activities
Hold open status	Hold open/pending status activities
Diversion	Diversion activities
Interstate compact	
Pending adjudication	* Interstate compact assessment work
Informal - unknown risk	* Face-to-face meetings
Informal - low risk	* In-court time
Informal - moderate risk	* In-drug court time
Informal - high risk	* Case management
Formal - unknown risk	* IDA data entry
Formal - low risk	* Other data entry (non-IDA)
Formal - moderate risk	* Report writing
Formal - high risk	* Out-of-state placement
Formal - sex offender	* Child welfare-related work
Waivers/reverse waivers	

Non-Case-Related Activities

Work performed by JCOs that does not relate to a *specific* case is defined as noncase-related activity. The key distinction between case-related and noncase-related activities is whether the activity is tied to a specific case that can be counted. Figure 2 (below) shows a list of noncase-related activities for which participants recorded their time during the work-time study. Note that prevention work is

best manner to count cases accurately in each case status category.

¹¹In Figure 1, activities for three case status types (intake/referral, hold open status, and diversion) the case status type is defined the same as the activity type. For all other case status types, the entire list of activities, beginning with interstate compact assessment work and ending with child welfare-referral work, were viable activity type options.

⁹ All juvenile court staff, including line officers, supervisors, deputy chief juvenile court officers, juvenile court specialists and administrative staff participated in the time study. The chief juvenile court officer in each of the eight districts did not participate in the study because they do not perform direct case-related work and SCA’s formula for CJCOs will remain one per district.

¹⁰ NCSC staff conducted a conference call with a subcommittee of the full committee to determine the

included on this list. While the prevention work is technically hands-on work with youth, the number of youth who are served in this capacity are not tracked and, therefore, cannot be counted. For this reason, the time was counted as noncase-related time.

Figure 2: Non-Case-Related Activities¹²

JCS supervision duties
Juvenile specialist staff work
Prevention work
General admin. Work
Community activities, etc.
Receiving education & training
General research
Work-related travel
Vacation, illness or other leave
NCSC data reporting time
Other non-case-related work

IV. Determining JCOs' Available Time for Case-Related Work

In every workload study, three factors contribute to the calculation of staffing needs:

- Numbers of cases (we used CY 2017 annual new cases),
- Workload values (weights) and
- JCO's annual *available time for case-related work (ATCW)*.

¹² Note that there are some noncase-related categories of time for which data were collected, but were removed from the analysis, because the time is either already captured in the JCO year value or because it is work that would not be done if not for this study. The former category includes: receiving

The relationship among these elements is expressed as follows:

- **Case-related workload (in minutes)** = Number of new cases X the workload values (weights)
- **Number of JCOs Needed** = Case-related workload ÷ JCO's ATCW value

The JCOs' ATCW value represents the average amount of time in a year that JCOs have to perform case-related work. Calculating this value is a three-stage process:

- (1) Determine how many days per year are available for JCOs to perform work (the *JCO work year*),
- (2) Determine how many business hours per day are available for case-related work as opposed to noncase-related work,
- (3) Multiply the numbers in steps 1 and 2, then multiply the result of that calculation by 60 minutes (per hour); this yields the JCOs' ATCW value, which is an estimate of the amount of time (in minutes) the "average" JCO has to do *case-related work* during the year.

Step 1: Determine the JCO work-year

Calculating the average JCO work-year requires determining the number of days per year that juvenile court officers have to perform their work. Starting with 365 days in a year, we subtracted 104 days for weekends, 11 for holidays, 29 for vacations and other types of leave (based on information from

education and training and vacation, illness and other leave; the latter category includes the NCSC data reporting time. The data that was removed from the analysis was replaced with the average work-time that was recorded by the study participants.

SCA’s Personnel and Finance Office), and 6 days for training programs – leaving a total of 215 available work-days. The workload formula assumes all JCOs work eight hours per day. Eight hours per day multiplied by 60 minutes (per hour) – multiplied by 215 days per year equals 103,200 minutes available per year for JCOs to perform all types of work (see Figure 3).

Figure 3: Calculating the Juvenile Court Officer Work-Year

Year Value	Days
Total Days per Year	365
<i>Subtract Non-Working Days:</i>	
Weekends	-104
Holidays	-11
Leave (sick, annual, other)*	-29
Training & staff development**	-6
Total Working Days Available	215
Total Working Days Available in Minutes	103,200

*Based on data from SCA’s Personnel & Finance Office.

**Based on consensus by committee members

Step 2: Determine the JCO work-day

For purposes of developing a weighted caseload formula, it is necessary to determine how much of a JCO’s work-day is available to perform *case-related* work. The staffing formula assumes JCOs work eight hours per day and that all JCOs perform work that falls into two general categories: (1) case-related time and (2) non-case-related time. Based on data from the one-month work-time study, the NCSC determined that JCOs spend an average of 2.23 hours per day

¹³ The 28,810 minutes of noncase-related time per year do **not** include noncase-related **travel time** per day, which **varies by district**. In the detailed formula shown in Appendix D, the **district-specific average travel minutes** per JCO are added to the 28,810

on *noncase-related* activities (excluding travel time) and .82 hours per day on travel time. That leaves an average of 4.95 hours per day for case-related work (see Figure 4).

Figure 4: JCO’s Average Available Time for Case-Related Work (ATCW value)

	Hours per Day	Minutes per Year*
A. Total Available Work Time	8.00	103,200
B. Subtract:		
- Avg noncase-related time (excluding travel time)	-2.23	-28,810
- Average travel time**	-0.82	-10,578
C. Total Avg Time for Case-related Work	4.95	63,812

*Hours/day X 60 minutes per hour x 215 days per year
 **Statewide average travel time per day per JCO. The detailed formula in Appendix D includes the average JCO travel time in each district, not the statewide average time.

Step 3: Determine the JCOs’ average annual available time for case-related work (ATCW value)

The last column of Figure 4 shows the calculations for determining the JCOs’ ATCW value.

1. Total available work time = 8 hours per day X 60 minutes hour X 215 days = 103,200 minutes per year.
2. Subtract non-case-related time: 2.23 hours per day, which is **28,810** minutes per year (plus the **district-specific average minutes of travel time** per JCO).¹³
3. Subtract noncase-related average travel time: .82 hours per day X 60 minutes per

minutes to determine the total average minutes of noncase-related work time for each district. Average travel minutes per JCO per day in each district are as follow: **D1:** 74.82, **D2:** 48.94, **D3:** 53.94, **D4:** 66.46, **D5:** 41.25, **D6:** 44.85, **D7:** 28.68, **D8:** 49.71.

hour X 215 days per year = 10,578 minutes per year.

4. The calculations in steps 1 to 3 shows that JCOs have an annual *average available time for case-related work (ATCW value)* of **68,815** minutes per year.

In the detailed weighted caseload formula in Appendix D, the actual average available time for case-related work varies somewhat from these calculations because that formula applies the district-specific average travel times for JCOs, rather than the statewide average travel time shown in Figure 4.¹⁴

The ATCW value is a key component of a weighted caseload formula for determining JCO staffing needs. The weighted caseload formula will determine the total demand for case-related work by multiplying the number of new cases for each of the 15 case types by the workload value (weight) for each of those case types. The sum of those calculations produces the total case-related workload demand for JCOs. Dividing the total workload demand for JCOs by the ATCW value produces an estimate of the number of JCOs needed to handle the case-related workload.

V. Iowa Juvenile Court Officer Time Study and Workload Values

A time study measures case complexity in terms of the average amount of JCO time actually spent managing different types of cases, from the initial referral or placement to termination of the case. This study collected time data on *all* case-related and noncase-related activities. For this study, JCS staff recorded all time spent on 15 case status types on a paper-based daily time log and then entered their time on a web-based data entry site.

As previously noted, juvenile court specialists (JC specialists) and administrative assistants (AAs) also participated in the work-time study. However, NCSC staff analyzed the data from JCSs and AAs, only a very small amount of their work was case-related or JCO work. Consequently, their work-time data could not be connected to new case numbers in a meaningful way, and the NCSC was unable to develop a weighted caseload formula for these positions. After discussing this issue, the committee recommended retaining formulas for JC specialists based on ratios of these positions to the number of JCOs in a district (e.g., 1 JC specialist per 4 JCOs).

Workload Values

All JCS staff statewide recorded all their work-time during the one-month period from October 2 through November 1, 2017. To calculate preliminary workload values (the

¹⁴ See previous footnote.

average amount of JCO time required to handle a particular case for a year) NCSC staff performed the following calculations:

(1) Start with the total case-related work-time on a specified case status type reported by JCOs during the 21 days of the work-time study,¹⁵

(2) Divide that number by 21 (the number of useable work days in the data collection period) to determine the daily average amount of work-time,

(3) Multiply the result of that calculation by 215 – the number of work days per year – which produces an estimate of the *annual* amount of case-related work-time on the case status type,¹⁶ and then

(4) Divide the annual amount of work-time on the case status type by the number of new cases for that case status type during the 2017 fiscal year.¹⁷

The workload values by case status type provide a picture of current juvenile court practices in Iowa, and the workload value time computations lined up as expected, with JCOs spending less time with low risk youth and more time with high risk youth.

It is noteworthy that JCOs working directly with problem-solving court programs (e.g., drug courts) participated in the work-time study, but problem-solving court cases

were not identified as a case status type because there is no mechanism with which to count the number of youth engaged in these programs. Research shows that problem-solving courts, drug courts in particular, are a cost-effective use of justice system resources. Problem-solving courts, when built on best practice standards, require a significant commitment of JCO time. Unfortunately, juvenile court case management data do not include “drug court” as a case status category. Youth who participate in drug court are likely included in the “formal moderate” and “formal high-risk” case status categories. In the future, if JCS implements a “drug court” case status category, a workload value could be developed for problem-solving court cases. This would probably reduce the workload values for the formal moderate and formal high-risk cases.

Figure 5 provides an example of the calculation of the workload value for the case status type of intake/referral. This process shown in Figure 5 is the same computing the workload values for all 15 case status types in this study.

¹⁵ The case management system was down for a 2-day period during the work-time study. While the data collection period spanned 23 working days, the 2 days on which the case management system was down significantly altered the work JCOs engaged in during that period. For this reason, the data for those dates (October 16-17) were removed from the database.

¹⁶ The formula to annualize work-time data per case status type is as follows: ((case-related work-time during the one-month study period / 21) * 215); see Figure 6.

¹⁷ The number of new cases in each case status category in FY 2017 were obtained from the Iowa Justice Data Warehouse and were provided by Kile Beisner, Research Coordinator for the Iowa Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning. Kile worked diligently with the Committee to determine the parameters of the data selected in each case status category.

How this Study Accounted for Leave Time and Vacant Positions

The methodology used in this study accounts for all authorized JCO positions, including the 18 JCO positions that were vacant during the study period. This was accomplished through a weighting process to approximate the full complement of authorized staff.

- *Leave time:* All leave time, time associated with education and training, and time required to participate in the work-time study was removed from the data and the remaining minutes were weighted to reflect the work reported by those individual JCOs when they were not on leave or engaged in the other work removed. (Leave and education time are accounted for in the JCO work year described in Figures 3 and 4.)

- *Vacant positions:*¹⁸ The NCSC used a similar process to account for the 18 vacant JCO positions. For example, if a district had 10 authorized JCO positions, but only 8 of those were filled, the work time recorded by the 8 JCOs who participated in the study was weighted by 1.25 to accommodate the vacancies ($10/8=1.25$; $8 \times 1.25=10$). Using this method, 100 minutes of work-time was treated as 125 minutes of work-time.

Figure 5: Example of Workload Value Calculation for Intake/Referrals

Developing Annualized Minutes	
(1) Total # of case-related work minutes recorded during the data collection period on intake/referrals	152,124
(2) Divide by	÷
# of work days in the data collection period	21
(3) Multiply by	X
Total # of JCO work days per year	215
Equals	=
Statewide annualized case-related work minutes for intake/referrals	1,557,460

Developing Initial Workload Value	
Statewide annualized case-related work minutes for intake/referrals	1,557,460
(4) Divide by	÷
# of FY 2017 intake/referrals	5,270
Equals	=
Initial Workload Value (average minutes spent per intake/referral case)	296

Based on the work-time study, JCOs in Iowa spend a total of 1,557,460 minutes of case-related time on intake/referrals annually.¹⁹ Dividing that time by the number of FY 2017 intake/referrals to JCS (5,270) yields a preliminary case weight of **296**

¹⁹ All time reported during the work-time study was weighted to reflect one year of time in order to ensure consistency with the FY 2017 new case data.

minutes per case. This number indicates that, on average, Iowa JCOs currently spend approximately 296 minutes on all activities associated with intake/referrals, as determined by the work-time study.

As shown in Figure 6, the number of annual new cases in each case status category are a critical factor in the calculation of the workload value (weight) for each case status type. Figure 6 shows the number of new cases for each case type category during FY 2017 and the percentage of the total filings that were accounted for by each case status category. Intake/ referrals comprise the largest percentage (34.9%) of total state filings.

Figure 6: New Cases in the Iowa Juvenile Court System in FY 2017

Pretrial Activities	Total New Cases	Percent of Total
Intake/referral	5,270	34.9%
Hold open status	1,325	8.8%
Diversion	2,666	17.6%
Interstate compact	106	0.7%
Pending adjudication	199	1.3%
Informal - unknown risk	326	2.2%
Informal - low risk	2,048	13.6%
Informal - moderate risk	583	3.9%
Informal - high risk	264	1.7%
Formal - unknown risk	261	1.7%
Formal - low risk	372	2.5%
Formal - moderate risk	513	3.4%
Formal - high risk	657	4.3%
Formal - sex offender	193	1.3%
Waivers/reverse waivers	323	2.1%
Statewide Total	15,106	100.00%

Figure 7 displays the complete set of statewide workload values for the 15 case types. By examining Figures 6 and 7 together, the utility of a weighted caseload system is easy to illustrate. Figure 6 presents the number of new cases in each case status category, while Figure 7 presents the

workload values for those case status types. The number of intake/referrals (n=5,270) comprises 34.9% of all of the new cases in FY 2017 and the number of formal high-risk cases (n=657) represents only 4.3% of the new cases. However, the workload value for formal high-risk cases (7,821 minutes per case annually) is approximately *16 times greater* than the time required for intake/referrals (296 minutes per case). Clearly, staffing formulas based solely on case counts do not differentiate the amount of time needed to manage each case status category.

Figure 7: Iowa Juvenile Court Officer Workload Values (Weights)

Pretrial Activities	Annual Workload Value (minutes)
Intake/referral	296
Hold open status	53
Diversion	41
Interstate compact	1,362
Pending adjudication	5,431
Informal - unknown risk	251
Informal - low risk	345
Informal - moderate risk	929
Informal - high risk	1,332
Formal - unknown risk	559
Formal - low risk	1,297
Formal - moderate risk	2,999
Formal - high risk	7,821
Formal - sex offender	4,771
Waivers/reverse waivers	925

VI. Qualitative Assessment of Workload Values

The work-time study provides the ability to determine how long JCOs take, on

average, to process different case status types. However, data on the average amount of time JCS staff *actually spend* on the various case types does not provide a basis for concluding whether that is a *sufficient amount of time* to perform their work in a *timely and high-quality manner*. To get a better sense of whether JCS staff feel they have enough time to do their work and to explain the struggles they experience in terms of addressing immeasurable impediments, the NCSC engaged in two types of qualitative data gathering. First, the NCSC provided access to all JCS staff to an Adequacy of Time Survey, and subsequently conducted focus groups in four locations across the state.

Adequacy of Time Survey

The NCSC distributed a web-based Adequacy of Time (AOT) survey to all juvenile court staff following the work-time study in November 2017. Approximately 76% of JCS staff members (n=166) completed the survey. As indicated above, the workload values identify the average amount of time JCOs *currently* spend handling cases, but they do not reveal whether that is *sufficient* time to ensure high-quality performance of job duties. The AOT survey supplemented the work-time study by assessing the extent to which JCS staff feel they have sufficient time to perform their in a timely and high quality manner.²⁰

Figure 8: Adequacy of Time Survey Layout

During the course of a normal work week or month, to what extent do you have sufficient time to perform the following types of work in a *timely and high-quality manner*.

CASE-RELATED WORK					
1	2	3	4	5	NA
Almost Never Have Enough Time		Usually Have Enough Time		Almost Always Have Enough Time	Does Not Apply
1. Intake work					
2. Work on cases held open/in pending status					
3. Diversion-related work					
4. Interstate compact work					
5. Face-to-face meetings with youth					
6. Time spent in juvenile drug court					
7. Other in-court time with youth					
8. IDA data entry/analysis					
9. Other data entry work					
10. Case-related report writing					
11. Child welfare-related work (TOPS/CFSR)					
12. Out-of-state placement work					
13. Work on cases pending adjudication					
14. Supervision of informal high risk youth					
15. Supervision of informal moderate risk youth					
16. Supervision of informal low risk youth					
17. Supervision of formal high risk youth					
18. Supervision of formal moderate risk youth					
19. Supervision of formal low risk youth					
20. Supervision of youth sex offenders on formal probation					
21. Work on waivers/reverse waiver cases					

Figure 8 (above) shows the wording and layout of the AOT survey questions and response range. Specifically, for each of the 15 separate case status types, and some activities, the survey asked respondents to rate the extent to which they feel they have

²⁰ Note that the workload values represent only **JCO time**; however, focus groups also included juvenile court specialists and administrative assistants.

sufficient time to perform each of the eight activities types identified in Figure 8. The survey asked participants to evaluate the statement, “For the following questions, please think of the work you recorded over the past month and consider a typical case within each case status type.”

Question: During the course of a normal work week or month, to what extent do you have sufficient time to perform the following types of work in a *timely and high-quality manner*?” The survey asked respondents to check one of five responses ranging from (1) “Almost Never Have Enough Time” to the (5) “Almost Always Have Enough Time”. Respondents also rated their ability to attend to noncase-related activities and they were asked to identify the three main impediments to keeping up with their case-related work. An example of the survey layout, illustrating case-related work, is provided in Figure 8.

NCSC staff compiled the responses and analyzed the results of the survey. For each case type, the NCSC calculated an average response score.²¹ Appendix C shows a complete set of the results. An average rating of 3.0 (“Usually have enough time”) was utilized as a threshold to determine whether JCS staff felt they had adequate time. An average rating of less than 3.0 was deemed to mean most staff members believe they do *not* “usually” have enough time to perform their daily tasks in a *timely and high-quality manner*. An average rating greater than 3.0 was deemed to mean most JCS staff members believe they do “usually” have

enough time to perform their daily tasks in a *timely and high-quality manner*.

Figure 9 shows the statewide average ratings from respondents for each of the case status types and certain activity categories. The findings show average scores of 3.0 or lower for the following five case-related activities: (8) IDA data entry/analysis, (9) other data entry work, (10) case-related report writing, (11) child welfare-related work, and (12) out-of-state placement work (highlighted in Figure 9). The other ratings were in the low-three scores, with the highest being 3.63 for (6) time spent in juvenile drug court.

Overall, these findings indicate that JCS staff feel they are just able to keep up with their work in the categories rated above 3.0. When asked about whether JCS staff have adequate time to address noncase-related work, the scores in every category were below 3.0 (all are highlighted).

Finally, JCS staff rated the following three categories as being the greatest impediments to keeping up with their case-related work:

1. Unpredictable nature of the job; dealing with emergency/crisis situations (67.47%);
2. Paperwork demands related to TOPS, NYTD, DHS, etc. (49.40%), and
3. Inadequate staffing/budget to meet workload demands (45.78%).

²¹ Responses of “Does Not Apply” were excluded from the average.

Figure 9: Adequacy of Time Survey Findings

Case Status Type/Activity	Weighted Average
1. Intake work	3.39
2. Work on cases held open / in pending status	3.44
3. Diversion-related work	3.46
4. Interstate compact work	3.26
5. Face-to-face meetings with youth	3.01
6. Time spent in juvenile drug court	3.63
7. Other in-court time with youth	3.57
8. IDA data entry/analysis	3.01
9. Other data entry work	2.87
10. Case-related report writing	3.00
11. Child welfare-related work (e.g., TOPS/ CFSR)	2.74
12. Out-of-state placement work	2.97
13. Work on cases pending adjudication	3.3
14. Supervision of high risk youth on informal adjustments	3.07
15. Supervision of moderate risk youth on informal adjustments	3.09
16. Supervision of low risk youth on informal adjustments	3.21
17. Supervision of high risk youth on formal probation	3.07
18. Supervision of moderate risk youth on formal probation	3.07
19. Supervision of low risk youth on formal probation	3.23
20. Supervision of youth sex offenders on formal probation	3.23
21. Work on waivers / reverse waiver cases	3.15
Non-Case-Related Activities	Weighted Average
22. Work on committees	2.25
23. General prevention activities	2.45
24. General professional reading (journals, etc.)	2.05
25. General caseload data & reports analysis	2.53
26. Community outreach activities	2.28
Impediments to Keeping up with Case-Related Work	Percent
Unpredictable nature of the job; dealing with emergency/crisis situations.	67.47%
Inadequate staffing/budget to meet workload demands.	49.40%
Paperwork demands related to TOPS, NYTD, DHS, etc.	45.78%
Technological difficulties (e.g., ICIS or email system being down; online detention screening tool problems).	36.75%
Lack of client/family cooperation/compliance (no shows, cancelled appointments, failure to provide requested information, etc.).	31.33%
Other agencies that are slow in providing necessary information.	21.08%
Unrealistic judicial expectations/requirements.	17.47%
Challenges in coordinating efforts among multiple agencies (e.g., court, JCS, DHS, CFSR, law enforcement) and meeting their standards.	14.46%
Rescheduling and delaying court hearings complicate scheduling of work time.	5.42%

Focus Groups

Workload assessment studies provide data regarding the time it takes to manage cases and engage in noncase-specific work. These work-time studies, however, do not provide qualitative information that can help explain those numbers or their shortcomings. NCSC staff sought a deeper understanding about the nature of the data collection period, reactions to initial study findings, variation in case management issues across the state and the sufficiency of time to perform key case-related and noncase-related activities. To achieve this goal, NCSC staff held four focus group sessions in four locations across the state of Iowa (Waterloo, Washington, Des Moines and Onawa) during the period between February 12 through 15, 2018. In all, 48 JCS employees, including juvenile court officers, administrative assistants and juvenile court specialists, from each of the eight judicial districts participated in the focus group sessions.

Across the focus group locations, the NCSC team heard a variety of comments on each of the main topics of interest; however, several themes also emerged. The next section presents themes that arose from the focus group discussions.

Focus Group Themes

Relative Case Weights

Focus group participants were asked to review the initial case weights, in bar graph form, ranging from the longest to shortest average case management times. NCSC staff did not present the numbers associated with the bars. Instead, they asked participants to comment on the length of the graph's bars in

relationship to one another. In general, focus group participants thought the case processing times appeared to be relatively consistent with their experience.

Urban and Rural Differences. All four focus groups noted significant differences in how JCS operates in urban and rural settings. Differences including variations in the level of services, including prevention services, variations in staffing, including many offices with only one person, and variations in prosecutorial practices. Some counties also have residential facilities, whereas officers in other counties have to travel significant distances to hold face-to-face meetings with their clients. Another noteworthy difference in rural areas is that the JCO is typically the only person in her or his office. This means they are required to do all job functions, including secretarial work, mail, phones, snow removal, and cleaning.

Interstate Compact Cases. In the focus group held in Onawa, officers commented that they felt interstate compact cases should have higher workload values. Given their proximity to both Nebraska and South Dakota, they get more of these cases and they take longer. Participants stated that Nebraska's interstate compact policies are stricter and do not allow for JCOs in Iowa to speak to the Nebraska officers, so initial case management takes longer. Also, neither Nebraska nor South Dakota have informal probation, so all interstate compact cases sent from those states must be supervised as formal and thus, more time consuming, cases.

Waiver and Reverse Waiver Cases. In Polk County (Iowa's most populous county), JCOs indicated that waivers/reverse waivers are more time-consuming in their county

than in other locations. Participants stated that they have more waiver and reverse waiver cases compared to the more rural districts, and that when they get them, the cases are more complicated than those in rural locations. (Note: This difference was not raised in other focus groups with urban representatives.)

Sex Offender Cases. The case management time for youth adjudicated for sexual offenses are lower than both the formal moderate and formal high-risk cases. In many states, these cases require more supervision than other types of cases. JCS staff indicated that, in Iowa, most of these cases are either placed in a residential setting or are outsourced to out-patient treatment, so the time required by JCOs is less than other moderate to high-risk cases. Participants also indicated that juveniles who have been adjudicated for sexual offenses have fewer delinquency issues that need to be addressed, which also requires less supervision time.

Diversion and Informal Low Risk Cases. Focus group participants indicated that there is little difference between case management/supervision of diversion and low risk cases. In D4, there are no diversion cases. Given this observation, JCOs supported combining diversion and low risk cases into one workload value category.

Hold Open/Intake. Participants questioned why *Hold Open* was identified as a separate case status category from intake. Again, there is variation in how cases are managed during this stage, but most participants thought that time should be added to the intake process, rather than identified as a separate category.

Non-case-related time. The work-time study indicated that JCOs spend, on average, 2.23 hours per day on noncase-related work, including prevention. Given the variation in how work is assigned across the state, most of the participants found it difficult to validate this number. Some thought it might be too low, pointing out that the combination of mandatory meetings, EPICS work and prevention work easily adds to more than 2.23 hours per day. Others felt they likely did less noncase-related work than 2.23 hours per day. In the end, all of the focus group participants agreed that they could not make a strong argument to either increase or decrease this time.

Work-Related Travel. Once again, variation in practice was the key point of discussion regarding travel. Some districts, such as D7 use placement officers to do the bulk of travel to see clients. In other districts, officers carpool to see clients to save on travel costs. This results in longer travel times for officers who may be gone for the better part of a day just to see one client, but the travel cost is reduced. Obviously, districts with more counties tend to have greater travel times than more urban districts. Many focus group participants indicated that recent changes within DHS resulted in closer placement facilities, which in turn, resulted in less travel to see these clients. When NCSC staff shared that we compared travel reimbursement data to the work-times study data in this category, and found the former to be lower, officers were not surprised. In every focus group, JCOs indicated that they often do not request travel reimbursement when driving in their own cars.

Data Collection Period

NCSC staff asked focus group participants whether they felt the data collection period (October 2 through November 1, 2017) represented an accurate picture of their work. While there were some anomalies that occurred, most participants indicated the data collection period was a typical representation of their workload. In one district, JCOs indicated that the work-time study came at a difficult time for them, as they were implementing some new programs and were learning many new supervision protocols. In another district, a specialist was on vacation, so JCOs had to pick up the work that person was not doing. Understanding that such “interruptions” to normal work will occur somewhere during any given time period, participants in each of the four focus groups agreed that the study period was generally representative of the work they do across the state.

Anything Not Captured?

Focus group participants were asked whether they were able to capture all the work they did. While some people reported that they were unsure which category best captured the work they did, eventually they found a place for everything.

Evidence-Based Practices

When asked whether JCOs felt there was adequate time to attend to all aspects of evidence-based practices (EBPs), the answer was a resounding “No!” Participants reported that with the supervision focus on high and moderate-risk youth, there is not enough time to engage in all of the expected activities, including logging all EPICS (Effective

Practices in Community Supervision) activities. Additionally, several JCO participants indicated that the higher-risk cases “blow up” more frequently than lower-risk cases, causing JCOs to respond to crisis situations, oftentimes after normal working hours. This work takes extra time and can take a mental toll on officers. One officer put it this way *“You have to deal with the crisis first, then you prioritize down the line. The ‘cruise control’ case gets ignored, and given the limited amount of time to work, we are not able to maintain fidelity to the EBP model.”* Other officers noted that the increase in “secretarial work” (meaning tracking activities and entering case notes) takes a lot more time, and this detracts from supervision activities.

JCOs were asked to estimate how many cases they could actually carry and engage in all of the expected EBP activities. Some JCOs estimated their caseloads should be reduced by 20%; others stated they could manage a caseload of 15-20 high/medium-risk cases or up to 25 cases if the mixture included low, moderate and high-risk probationers. Several officers indicated that the most important part of engaging in EBPs is adequate planning, which they feel is not available with higher caseloads. Finally, officers again noted the increased time requirements in supervising higher-risk cases with limited resources.

JCOs in all focus groups indicated they cannot fully meet the EPICS requirements, so the work does not get reported, even if partially fulfilled. One JCO stated: *“I cannot supervise my clients to full fidelity and I can’t get to the documentation showing that I’m doing EPICS. There is just*

not enough time. In terms of documentation, if it is not in the computer, it did not happen.” Many JCOs indicated frustration at the feeling that there is more concern with reporting what they are doing, than in actually performing the work.

When asked what EBP work is not getting done on a regular basis, JCOs noted the following:

- Dosage, especially in the rural areas,
- Recommended number of face-to-face meetings and phone calls, noting that travel, time and caseload sizes contribute to fewer contacts,
- Prioritizing contacts with kids in facilities impedes the ability to meet contacts with youth in the community,
- Data entry,
- Court reports.

District Specific Issues

Aside from the notion that work is done differently in each county/district, no real district-specific differences were noted. The issue that was cited most frequently under this topic was the need for greater support by JCS specialists (administrative support staff), that would allow the JCOs to do the direct work with probationers.

If You Could Make One Change

The final question posed to focus group participants was “From your perspective, if there was one thing you could change about your job to make case processing more efficient, what would it be?” Responses to this question were remarkably consistent, with the following topics:

- Less data entry/bean counting,²²
- Fix ICIS so officers and other staff do not spend so much time engaging in workarounds. Specific issues identified with ICIS include:
 - No ability to see allegations and other information on youth to complete the screening instrument. Officers can only see the complaints, not the allegation, charge or disposition, which can often result in incorrect risk level determination;
 - Information does not populate from the short screening form to the long form, requiring duplicate data entry,
 - Configure ICIS to generate reports that would be useful to supervision officers.
- Explore technology to improve the ability to meet with probationers in ways outside of the traditional face-to-face meetings, such as using Skype to meet with youth in placement, texting youth to check in, and the ability to review clients' social media accounts (state computer use policy does not allow access to these sites),
- Design the care-match process to be more efficient. Officers described a process in which they have to check on-line lists for placement availability, rather than placing a name on a wait-list which would be more time-efficient,
- Reduce the need to complete paperwork for DHS-involved youth, which is tedious and time-consuming; some JCOs questioned why probation, and not DHS,

was required to complete this paperwork,

- Provide flexibility to work from home, especially on snow-days, and flexibility with work schedules. Many focus group participants felt the 8:00 – 4:30 working day is too constrictive, both in terms of seeing clients and in terms of real-life necessities,
- Provide support around secondary trauma issues for all judicial staff,
- Reduce caseload sizes,
- Remove expectations that JCOs complete work that is not being done by others in the system. To illustrate this point, one JCO stated *“We care about doing our job, and we want to do it right, but we can’t when we are picking up the slack of the other people who are not doing their jobs, such as completing additional investigations and restitution needs for the county attorney, or completing judges’ orders,”*
- Finally, one officer simply asked that the Judicial Department be adequately funded, to which all participants in that session agreed.

Focus Groups Summary

The work-time study conducted in Iowa measures the amount of time juvenile court officers currently spend investigating, planning and supervising cases. *A time study does not inform us about the amount of time judicial officers **should** spend on activities to ensure the quality processing of cases.* In fact, one focus group member raised the concern

²² Focus group participants indicated they understand the importance of data and data entry, but feel they

are asked to prioritize data entry over actual casework, which causes significant frustration.

that, since the time study was conducted during a time of financial and staffing constraints, which influenced JCS case management practices, the new workload formula is grounded in these processes. There was concern that the new formula would perpetuate these practices.

Some participants in the focus groups raised concerns about urban and rural differences in the way JCS staff manage juvenile cases. They also raised some concerns about the workload values for the following case categories:

- Interstate compact cases
- Waiver and reverse-waiver cases
- Sex offender cases
- Diversion and informal low risk cases
- Hold open/intake
- Non-case-related time
- Work-related travel variation

- **Evidence-Based Practices**

Caseloads are too large to supervise higher-risk youth effectively according to the EPICS expectations. Time constraints posed by conflicting priorities, such as meeting contact standards with youth in residential care, completing case-related paperwork/data entry and attending to crises, combine to limit the ability to engage in all planning and casework expectations. Officers estimated they could sufficiently carry caseloads of 15-25, depending on the mixture of risk levels.

- **Efficiency Changes**

Participants provided a range of ideas that could make JCO supervision work more efficient, including:

- Reductions in paper-work and data entry, including that work done on other agencies' behalf (DHS, county attorney, court),
- Increased use of technology to check in with clients, as well as making improvements to ICIS,
- Increased job flexibility, including the ability to work from home and the ability to work flexible hours.

The Workload Formula Committee discussed the AOT and focus group findings at great length. The committee members found the results of both of the qualitative data gathering reports to be compelling regarding time constraints and other impediments, however, felt there was no move to adjust workload values. Committee members believe the workload values appear to be correct and show the time expenditure by case status types that would be expected – generally in rank order of risk level. Committee members believe that if the JCS staffing levels are brought up to the recommended levels, based on need – and including the funding of currently vacant positions -- that the staff could effectively manage the youth under their jurisdiction.

VII. Juvenile Court Officer Workload Calculation and Support Staff Needs

NCSC staff completed development of a weighted caseload formula for determining the need for JCO staff once the committee reviewed and agreed upon the

four critical components of a weighted caseload formula:

- (1) The *average* annual available time JCOs have to do **case-related** work (74,390 minutes per year; see Figure 4),
- (2) The average annual time spent on **non-case-related** work activities (28,812 minutes per year; see Figure 4),
- (3) The **workload values** (weights) for all 15 case status types (see Figure 7), and
- (4) The **number of new cases** that entered the JCS system in FY 2017 in each of the 15 case status categories (see Figure 6).

Figure 10 displays the steps taken to compute the need for JCO staff.

Figure 10: Calculation Steps for Determining the Need for JCOs*

For Each Case Status Type:	
Step 1	<i>Workload value x new cases = workload</i>
For Each Case Status Type:	
Step 2	<i>Sum individual case status type workloads to obtain the total workload for each district (total minutes of work expected)</i>
For Each District:	
Step 3	<i>Divide the total workload by the juvenile court officer year value (case related minutes) to obtain juvenile court officer resource needs</i>
For Each District:	
Step 4	<i>Subtract the non-case-related and work related travel time from the annual work time availability</i>

*Appendix D provides details on the weighted caseload calculations by district and statewide.

Determining the Need for JCOs

Incorporating the four critical components of a weighted caseload formula (above) and the four calculation steps in Figure 10, the NCSC constructed the weighted caseload formula shown in Appendix D. That

formula estimates that JCS needs **206.9 FTE** JCOs statewide to manage the caseload effectively (see Figure 11, column D).

Figure 11: Initial Weighted Case Formula for JCOs Compared to Current JCO Staffing Levels*

District	A # JCOs Author- ized	B Current # of JCO Vacan- cies	C # of Filled JCO Posi- tions	D # JCOs Needed by New Wgtd Case Formula	E # Filled vs. # Needed [C-D]	F # Author- izezd vs. # Needed [A-D]
1	21	-3	18	26.4	-8.4	-5.4
2	26	-4	22	23.3	-1.3	2.7
3	24	-2	22	23.1	-1.1	0.9
4	12	0	12	15.2	-3.2	-3.2
5	50	-4	46	51.7	-5.7	-1.7
6	24	-1	23	24.4	-1.4	-0.4
7	19	-2	17	19.0	-2.0	0.0
8	17	-2	15	23.8	-8.8	-6.8
State	193	-18	175	206.9	-31.9	-13.9

*Appendix D provides a detailed description of the weighted caseload model for assessing the need for JCOs.

The 206.9 FTE positions are **32 positions more than are currently filled** statewide (see column E).

As previously noted, the committee expressed confidence in the workload values for each of the 15 case types because the values were consistent with expectations: high-risk youth on formal probation had the highest weight, diversion cases had the lowest weight, and the weights for all the other case types fell in the expected order. However, the committee expressed concern about the way the weighted caseload formula allocated the need for JCOs among the districts (see Figure 11, column D). For example, representatives from Districts 1 and 8 believed their districts did not need 8 or more additional JCOs as the formula indicated (see Figure 11, column E). Conversely,

committee members from Districts 2 and 3 thought the estimates of the number of JCOs they needed were too low. After considerable discussion, the committee concluded that the apparent misallocation of JCO positions among the districts very likely arose due to differences in the way the districts counted some of the 15 case status categories.²³ While the committee believed the formula produced a reasonable estimate of the overall statewide need for JCOs (206.9 FTEs), the committee concluded it needed to develop an *alternative model* for allocating to positions among the districts.

After discussing alternatives for allocating JCO positions among the districts, the committee agreed to recommend that SCA adopt a multi-step strategy for determining the need for JCO positions in each judicial district. Figure 12 shows the steps in the hybrid allocation formula:²⁴

- (1) **Col. A** = Total youth population (age 5-17) in each district in Iowa in 2017; **Col. B** = % of total statewide youth population that resides in each district.
- (2) **Col. C** = Total youth population (age 5-17) in poverty in each district in 2017; **Col. D** = % of state's youth in poverty that resides in each district.
- (3) Determine the number of JCOs needed statewide (**206.9 FTEs**) based on the NCSC's weighted case status-type formula in Appendix D, row 20.
- (4) **Col. E**: Allocate **80%** of the 206.9 FTEs (**165.5**) according to the % of the total statewide youth population that resides in the district (Col. E, row 9).
- (5) **Col. F**: Allocate **20%** of the 206.9 FTEs (**41.4**) according to the % of the total

statewide youth in poverty that resides in the district (Col. F, row 9).

(6) **Col. G** = Col. E + Col. F.

Figure 12: Recommended Hybrid Formula for Allocating JCO Positions to Each District

Row	District	A	B	C	D	E*	F*	G*
		2017 Woods & Poole Est: Total # of Kids (5-17)	% of State Kids Pop. (A/A9)	US Census: # of kids in poverty	% of state's kids in poverty (C/C9)	Wgt 80% of JCO formula on % of youth pop. (165.5) X Col. B	Wgt 20% of JCO formula on % youth poverty (41.4) X Col. D	Total FTE JCOs Needed per District (E + F)
1	1	60,923	11.5%	8,280	11.6%	19.1	4.8	23.9
2	2	71,520	13.6%	9,170	12.9%	22.4	5.3	27.8
3	3	58,288	11.0%	8,167	11.5%	18.3	4.7	23.0
4	4	31,200	5.9%	4,978	7.0%	9.8	2.9	12.7
5	5	139,474	26.4%	16,942	23.8%	43.8	9.8	53.6
6	6	71,988	13.6%	8,000	11.2%	22.6	4.6	27.2
7	7	52,299	9.9%	7,875	11.1%	16.4	4.6	21.0
8	8	41,869	7.9%	7,841	11.0%	13.1	4.6	17.7
9	All	527,561	100%	71,253	100%	165.5	41.4	206.9

* The weighted case formula in Appendix D shows the statewide need for 206.9 FTE JCO positions. 80% of **206.9** = **165.5** FTEs (Col. E, row 9); 20% of 206.9 = **41.4** FTEs (Col. F, row 9).

Figure 12 shows the results of this multi-step or *hybrid model* for determining the statewide need for JCOs and allocating those positions among the districts. The advisory committee believes more the recommended hybrid model more equitably distributes the 206.9 FTE JCO positions among the districts than the *initial weighted case formula* shown in Appendix D (also see Figure 11, columns D - E). For example, the initial weighted case formula in Figure 11 indicates Districts 1 and 8 would need more than eight additional JCOs. The recommended *hybrid* formula for

²³ For example, Districts 4 and 8 do not code any cases as *diversion* (see Appendix D). They manage many cases in a manner very similar to diversion cases in other districts, but they code these cases as "informal

low risk" in the case management system. Conversely, District 6 codes relatively few cases as "informal low."

²⁴ Also, see Appendix E.

allocating the 206.9 JCO positions indicates that District 1 needs 5.9 additional FTE JCOs, while District 8 needs an additional 2.7 FTE JCOs (see Figure 13). The hybrid model’s allocation is consistent with the level of JCO staffing needs expected by committee members and chief juvenile court officers.

Figure 13: JCO Positions Needed Compared to Number of Positions Filled – By District

	A*	B	C**	D	E	F	G
District	Need for FTE JCOs by District	# JCOs Authorized	# JCO Positions Filled	# Authorized vs. # Needed [B-A]	# Filled vs. # Needed [C-A]	Auth vs Need: % short (D/A)	Filled vs Need: % short (E/A)
1	23.9	21	18	-2.9	-5.9	-12%	-25%
2	27.8	26	22	-1.8	-5.8	-6%	-21%
3	23.0	24	22	1.0	-1.0	4%	-4%
4	12.7	12	12	-0.7	-0.7	-6%	-6%
5	53.6	50	46	-3.6	-7.6	-7%	-14%
6	27.2	24	23	-3.2	-4.2	-12%	-15%
7	21.0	19	17	-2.0	-4.0	-10%	-19%
8	17.7	17	15	-0.7	-2.7	-4%	-15%
All	206.9	193	175	-13.9	-31.9	-7%	-15%

*Column A: See column G in Figure 12

**JCO positions filled on 3.30.18.

Figure 13 (above) shows the need for JCO positions based on the recommended hybrid allocation formula in Figure 12 compared to current staffing levels. The 207 JCO positions needed statewide is 32 positions (15%) more than the number of currently filled positions (175) and 14 positions (7%) more than the number of JCO positions (193) currently authorized. When comparing the need for JCOs in each district to the current number of filled positions, the shortages range from a 25% shortage in District 1 to a 4% shortage in District 3. When comparing the need for JCOs with the number

of authorized positions, the districts range from a 12% shortage in Districts 1 and 6 to a small surplus of 4% in District 3.

Overall, the committee believes this hybrid model accurately reflects the statewide need for JCOs and more accurately allocates those JCO positions among the districts. Therefore, *the committee recommends that SCA adopt this hybrid model for determining the need for JCO positions and allocating those positions among the districts.*

Determining the Need for Juvenile Court Specialist Staff

The JCS division of the judicial branch has two categories of staff that provide support to JCOs: juvenile court specialists (JC specialists) provide a range of administrative support (e.g., data entry, scheduling, managing telephone calls) for JCOs. In addition, each district is supervised by a Chief JCO (CJCO) and each CJCO has one administrative assistant (AA) to provide secretarial and other assistance.²⁵ In the past, these support positions have been authorized according to ratio-based formulas: a district received one JC specialist position for every four JCO positions, and every CJCO received one AA.

JC specialists and administrative assistants participated in the one-month work-time study as part of this project. However, as explained earlier, almost all their time was spent on noncase-related time (not focused on specific cases), so creating a formula based on case-related workload values (case weights) was not feasible. Given

²⁵ Seven of the eight districts have one AA; District 8 has two AAs.

the inability to create a weighted caseload formula for these support staff, the committee *recommends the continued use of ratio-based formulas for JC specialists (one for every four authorized JCOs) and administrative assistants (one for each CJCO).*

Figure 14 (below) shows the ratio-based formula for JC specialists. Column A shows the current number of *authorized* JCOs in each district. (It would be inappropriate to base the ratio on the number of *filled* positions since the JCO positions are substantially below the number needed according to the new hybrid formula (above). Column B applies the ratio calculation by dividing the number of authorized JCO positions by four.

Figure 14: Juvenile Court Specialist (JCS) -- Formula, Authorized, and Filled Positions

District	A JCOs Authorized	B JC Specialists Needed by Formula (A/4)	C Current # of JC Specialists Authorized	D Current JC Specialist Positions Filled	E # Filled is above (+) or below (-) Formula (D-B)
1	21	5.3	6.4	5.8	0.6
2	26	6.5	7.0	4.0	-2.5
3	24	6.0	5.7	5.7	-0.3
4	12	3.0	3.2	3.0	0.0
5	50	12.5	13.6	13.6	1.1
6	24	6.0	6.6	3.0	-3.0
7	19	4.8	5.0	4.0	-0.8
8	17	4.3	5.0	3.0	-1.3
State Total	193	48.3	52.5	42.1	-6.2

The formula in column B shows a need for **48.3** JC specialist positions statewide. That number is **4.2** FTE positions *less* than the **52.5** JC specialist positions than currently authorized by SCA (see column C). However, due to several JC specialist vacancies (compare columns C and D) –

currently held open because of financial constraints – there are **5.2** fewer JC specialist positions that are currently *filled* than the number *needed* according to the formula (see column E). District 6 has the greatest shortage at three positions (50%) below the formula, while District 5 has 1.1 FTE positions more than the formula indicates it needs.

Qualitative Factors Affecting the Determination of Staffing Needs

While the recommended weighted caseload formula should be the primary means for determining the need for JCOs in each district, qualitative factors also can affect JCS staffing needs a could play a role in making decisions about adjustments to JCO staffing needs.

For example, the focus groups discussed a range of issues that could influence the JCS workload (see section VI). The differences in how rural and urban counties are able to manage their caseloads was a recurring theme in the four focus groups. A weighted caseload formula provides staffing resources based on statewide average amount of time spent by JCOs on each of the case types. While that is a reasonable strategy for equitably allocating scarce resources, it is also reasonable to be aware of urban-rural differences. There are clearly efficiencies in the management of the JCS workload where numerous JCOs are located in the same county. Consequently, it might be reasonable to adjust the allocations from the weighted caseload formula to accommodate these differences.

In addition, special programming – like juvenile drug courts – might require more JCO time than the “average” programming for

youth. The weighted workload formula does not provide a case weight for drug court cases, so the formula does not give credit to districts that have drug court programs. Some adjustment to the weighted caseload formula might be reasonable in districts with these programs.

VIII. Keeping the Workload Assessment Model Current and Future Use of the Model

SCA should update the formula each year with the most recent year of filings or the average annual filings from the most recent two or three years. This will ensure that the model is as accurate and timely as possible for the next year.

In the absence of any significant changes in case management, organizational structure or legislation in the Iowa juvenile court system, the workload values developed during the course of this study should be accurate for five to seven years. However, periodic updating is necessary to ensure that the workload values continue to represent the JCS workload accurately. Increased efficiencies, statutory or procedural changes, changes in case counting practices or the implementation of various case management initiatives over time may result in significant changes in case processing. If any of these occur, SCA will need to update the workload values by conducting a new work-time study.

IX. Recommendations

The NCSC joins with the committee to offer the first six recommendations, and the

NCSC offers four additional recommendations of its own.

Joint Recommendations:

1. SCA should give high priority to filling at least the current *18 JCO vacancies* as soon as possible -- especially in light of the finding that there is a need for *14 additional JCOs* statewide beyond those vacancies (see Figure ES-2). Committee members feel strongly that *the staffing deficit is urgent* and prohibits JCOs from attending to the needs of youth under their supervision. Without adequate staffing, more youth supervised by JCS could transition into the adult justice system. In addition, as soon as it is financially feasible to do so, SCA should fully staff JCS up to effective staffing levels, as determined by the workload assessment formula.
2. SCA should use the weighted caseload formula (see Appendix D) to determine the *statewide* need for JCO positions, and should adopt the formula in Appendix E for allocating those JCO positions among the districts.
3. The Chief JCOs should work toward achieving standardization and consistency in case status type definitions and data entry for case counts in the near future. Consistency in case coding and case counting will enhance confidence in the case counts and the staffing formula.
4. SCA should consider hiring a data analyst who focuses solely on the juvenile

court system.²⁶ Such a position would be responsible for collecting and analyzing data specific for JCS and providing necessary feedback to Chief JCOs, SCA, the supreme court, and other state agencies regarding JCS caseloads and performance.

5. Three of the eight judicial districts maintain juvenile drug courts, which require staff to coordinate the program as well as JCOs who dedicate significant amounts of time to supervise youth placed in these specialized court programs. Data limitations prevented the NCSC from developing a workload value for these problem-solving courts. SCA and JCOs should develop a mechanism to track these cases in the case management system to be able to account for the number of youth in these programs. Best practices in problem-solving courts include, among other things, tracking success rates of problem-solving court participants. Having the ability to count these cases is critical to implementing this best practice standard.
6. SCA should maintain the current ratio of one juvenile court specialist for every four JCOs (1:4) and one administrative assistant for each district.^{27 28}

²⁶ JCS has relied on data analysis and support from the executive branch's Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning for a very long time. The Chief JCOs and others in the judicial branch are becoming more reliant on data for planning and performance management. Relying solely on this executive branch agency, which faces staffing constraints of its own, could limit the amount of support JCS needs to operate effectively and engage in efforts to implement best practices.

²⁷ The Chief JCOs in 7 of the 8 judicial districts have 1 administrative assistant (AA), while there are 2 AAs in

NCSC Recommendations:

7. SCA should update the weighted caseload formula annually, using the number of new cases filed for the 15 case status types during the most recent calendar year or the average number of filings over the most recent two or three years.
8. SCA should update the workload values in this weighted caseload model every five to seven years by conducting a statewide study of the work-time of JCOs. This is the only way to ensure the workload values accurately reflect the nature and complexity of the workload and evolving practices and juvenile court technology across the state.
9. SCA should consider establishing *minimum staffing levels in each JCS office location*. Consider staffing every office with at least two employees, perhaps a JCO and a juvenile court specialist to allow the office to remain open during regular working hours. This would also free up the JCO to engage in field visits while leaving the office open for people to check in and/or drop off information.
10. JCS staff who supervise youth in drug courts carry smaller caseloads than the average JCO because youth in drug courts

District 8. District 8 covers 14 counties, but District 2 includes 22 counties and Districts 3 and 5 have 16 counties each.

²⁸ Each district also has one contract administrator. These positions are paid for with graduated sanctions funds obtained from the Department of Human Services. They did not participate in the work-time study for this project and are not accounted for in the weighted case formula. If graduated sanctions funds are reduced in the future, the judicial branch will need to fund positions to fulfill the duties performed by the contract administrators.

require more supervision. Because this study did not develop a workload value for drug court cases, the weighted caseload formula probably underestimates somewhat the need for JCOs districts with drug courts. SCA

should consider this when determining JCO staffing needs in those districts.

Appendices

Appendix A: Iowa Juvenile Court Services Workload Study Case Status Types and Activities

Case <u>Status</u> Categories	Case-related <u>Activity</u> Types
<p>1. INTAKE/REFERRAL Includes cases that are at the intake/referral phase, including cases in which a youth is currently under supervision and has a new referral for a different matter. Include work completed on cases in <i>pending status</i> in this category, this includes work done on detention-related or shelter cases. INCLUDE cases for which no petition has been filed and youth are recommended or are in either detention or shelter.</p>	<p>1. INTAKE/REFERRAL All activities associated with new referral/intakes leading a decision to proceed with an informal or formal handling of the youth., e.g., reviewing referral / complaint info., speaking with youth, parent/guardians, law enforcement; collecting victim restitution info; entry of info into ICIS; completing risk assessment instruments, etc.</p>
<p>2. HOLD OPEN STATUS All cases that are being held open for various reasons, (e.g., collecting additional information from law enforcement, waiting on restitution, waiting on treatment information). This includes post-intake, while JCOs are waiting on additional information to make a decision.</p>	<p>2. HOLD OPEN / PENDING STATUS All work done while cases are in hold open status.</p>
<p>3. DIVERSION (<i>includes pre-diversion and diversion cases</i>) All cases in diversion or pre-diversion status.</p>	<p>3. DIVERSION (<i>includes pre-diversion and diversion cases</i>) All activities associated with diversion after a diversion agreement has been made, including: data entry, phone calls, paper work, restitution payments, collateral contacts, UAs, etc.</p>
<p>4. INTERSTATE COMPACT CASES INTO IOWA Include work on all cases sent to Iowa for consideration as interstate supervision cases. Once accepted and scored for risk, record time under the appropriate supervision status category.</p>	<p>4. INTERSTATE COMPACT ACCEPTANCE & SUPERVISION WORK Includes all activity associated with evaluation for acceptance and all supervision activities, once accepted, on IC cases.</p>

*For “case status categories” 1 - 5, the “case activity type” must be the one immediately to the right of the case status category.

Continued on the next page.

Case Status Categories*	Case-related Activity Types
<p>5. PENDING ADJUDICATION All cases for which a case has been referred to or filed with the county attorney, but for which the youth has not been formally adjudicated or granted a consent decree. Once adjudicated, record time associated with these cases in the appropriate supervision/risk category.</p>	<p>5. <u>FACE-TO-FACE MEETINGS</u> All meetings conducted with the supervised youth and/or parent/guardian, regardless of whether they are individual or the youth is accompanied by other persons. Include conducting groups, such as gender-specific, anger management, life skills, etc.</p>
<p>6. INFORMAL – UNKNOWN RISK All cases placed on informal probation (on an informal adjustment) for which the youth has not yet been scored on the IDA</p>	<p>6. <u>IN-COURT TIME (excluding in drug court)</u> Time spent in court including waiting for hearings and any time testifying or reporting to the judge.</p>
<p>7. INFORMAL – LOW RISK All cases placed on informal probation (on an informal adjustment) for which the youth scores low risk on the IDA.</p>	<p>7. <u>IN-DRUG COURT TIME</u> Time spent in juvenile drug court or with community panels including waiting for hearings and any time testifying or reporting to the judge/panel.</p>
<p>8. INFORMAL – MODERATE All cases placed on informal probation (on an informal adjustment) for which the youth scores moderate risk on the IDA.</p>	<p>8. <u>CASE MANAGEMENT</u> Time spent outside of court on case plan development, IDA analysis, UA sample activities, processing paperwork, case-related phone calls, meetings with treatment or other providers and any other work activity that does not fall into one of the other activity types. Include YTDM, transition committee meetings. Does NOT include data entry.</p>
<p>9. INFORMAL – HIGH All cases placed on informal probation (on an informal adjustment) for which the youth scores high risk on the IDA.</p>	<p>9. <u>IDA DATA ENTRY</u> All data entry work specific to the IDA</p>
<p>10. FORMAL – UNKNOWN RISK All court cases for which the youth has not yet been scored on the IDA.</p>	<p>10. <u>DATA ENTRY (OTHER, NON-IDA)</u> All data entry work OTHER than data entry of IDA, including police reports, entry of UA data, etc.</p>
<p>11. FORMAL – LOW (includes consent decrees cases) All court cases for which the youth scores low risk on the IDA.</p>	<p>11. <u>REPORT WRITING</u> All time associated with writing reports, including research (may include home visits to obtain report information), writing and typing.</p>
<p>12. FORMAL MODERATE (includes consent decrees cases) All court cases for which the youth scores moderate risk on the IDA. Includes youth who are in placement.</p>	<p>12. <u>OUT OF STATE PLACEMENT</u> All activity associated with placing clients in schools/facilities outside of the state of Iowa (not including interstate compact work).</p>
<p>13. FORMAL – HIGH* (includes consent decree cases) All court cases for which the youth scores high risk on the IDA. Includes youth who are in placement.</p>	<p>13. <u>CHILD WELFARE-RELATED WORK</u> All work requirements such as TOPS/CFSR, care match, etc., excluding JVIS.</p>
<p>14. FORMAL – SEX OFFENDER All court cases for which the offense is a sex offense. Includes youth who are in placement.</p>	
<p>15. WAIVERS/REVERSE WAIVERS Include all waiver or reverse waiver cases in this status category</p>	

*For “case status categories” 5 – 15, the “case activity type” could be any one of the activity types (5–13).

Appendix B: Iowa Juvenile Court Services Workload Study Non-Case-Related Activities

A. JCS SUPERVISION (ADMINISTRATION/PERSONNEL) DUTIES

All time associated with SUPERVISOR-SPECIFIC administrative tasks, including personnel matters, meetings and other work limited to supervisors.

B. JUVENILE SPECIALIST STAFF WORK

Includes administrative work done by juvenile specialists that is NOT CONSIDERED JCO WORK. This category will be used for work that is classified as juvenile specialist work, and is work not generally engaged in by JCOs.

C. PREVENTION WORK

Time spent on activities or programs that are considered to be prevention-oriented, which may include, but not be limited to, cases tracked/monitored or other prevention work. This includes work with persons who are not officially in the system, but who are interested in participating in such programs/processes

D. GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE WORK

All time associated with general administrative tasks required for your job, such as completing time sheets and other administrative paperwork, reading emails, listening to voice mails and returning calls/emails.

E. COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES, COMMITTEES, MEETINGS & RELATED WORK & PROVIDING TRAINING

All time spent engaging in community activities, committee or other non-supervision-related meetings, including staff meetings, state and local committee meetings. Also include work associated with such meetings, such as reviewing material or developing meeting materials. Includes providing training to other professionals.

F. RECEIVING EDUCATION & TRAINING

Includes all time spent in professional training, continuing education and attending conferences, whether in person or on-line.

G. GENERAL RESEARCH AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Includes all time spent doing general research or reading professional literature.

H. WORK-RELATED TRAVEL

All non-commuting travel time associated with JCO work, including home visits, school visits, visits with treatment providers, etc. Includes all reimbursable travel time.

I. VACATION, ILLNESS OR OTHER LEAVE

Record all time away from the office due to vacation, illness or other personal leave time.

J. OTHER

Any noncase-related activity not included on this list that is done in your professional capacity.

K. NCSC DATA REPORTING TIME

All time associated with tracking and entering your data for the current time study.

Appendix C: Adequacy of Time Survey Findings

In what district do you work?	Responses	
1A	7.23%	12
1B	6.02%	10
2A	6.02%	10
2B	10.24%	17
3A	4.22%	7
3B	3.61%	6
4	6.02%	10
5A	10.24%	17
5B	1.81%	3
5C	12.05%	20
6	9.64%	16
7	13.25%	22
8A	4.82%	8
8B	4.82%	8
	Answered	166

Please indicate your position:	Responses	
JCO I	0.00%	0
JCO II	24.70%	41
JCO III	42.17%	70
JCO IV	11.45%	19
JCS drug court officer	0.00%	0
JCS CIO	2.41%	4
JCS Specialist	16.27%	27
Administrative Assistant	3.01%	5
	Answered	166

Years of service in Iowa JCS System:

Range: 1 – 48.5 years

Median: 16.75 years

Mean: 16.9 years

For the following questions, please think of the work you recorded over the past four weeks and consider a typical case within each case type. Question 1: During the course of a normal work week or month, to what extent do you have sufficient time to perform the following types of work in a timely and high-quality manner?

Case-Related Work:	1 - I Almost Never Have Enough Time	2	3 - I Usually Have Enough Time	4	5 - I Almost Always Have Enough Time	I Don't Usually Do This	Weighted Average
1. Intake work	5	14	56	17	27	47	3.39
2. Work on cases held open / in pending status	5	10	67	16	30	38	3.44
3. Diversion-related work	3	15	49	14	29	56	3.46
4. Interstate compact work	3	18	50	15	18	62	3.26
5. Face-to-face meetings with youth	12	32	49	17	20	36	3.01
6. Time spent in juvenile drug court	0	1	9	1	5	150	3.63
7. Other in-court time with youth	4	9	57	17	35	44	3.57
8. IDA data entry/analysis	8	31	66	13	18	30	3.01
9. Other data entry work	15	49	61	16	21	4	2.87
10. Case-related report writing	5	30	60	14	13	44	3.00
11. Child welfare-related work (e.g., TOPS/CF SR)	10	42	48	12	9	45	2.74
12. Out-of-state placement work	2	7	23	2	4	128	2.97
13. Work on cases pending adjudication	3	13	70	23	17	40	3.30
14. Supervision of high risk youth on informal adjustments	5	26	46	17	13	59	3.07
15. Supervision of moderate risk youth on informal adjustments	4	28	49	16	15	54	3.09
16. Supervision of low risk youth on informal adjustments	4	21	48	16	18	59	3.21
17. Supervision of high risk youth on formal probation	7	31	42	23	15	48	3.07
18. Supervision of moderate risk youth on formal probation	5	31	47	21	14	48	3.07
19. Supervision of low risk youth on formal probation	5	18	51	15	19	58	3.23
20. Supervision of youth sex offenders on formal probation	4	21	38	17	17	69	3.23
21. Work on waivers / reverse waiver cases	6	19	57	18	15	51	3.15

Noncase-Related Work:	1 - I Almost Never Have Enough Time	2	3 - I Usually Have Enough Time	4	5 - I Almost Always Have Enough Time	I Usually Don't Do This	Weighted Average
22. Work on committees	25	49	38	4	3	47	2.25
23. General prevention activities	28	37	41	6	10	44	2.45
24. General professional reading (journals, etc.)	55	41	22	5	10	33	2.05
25. General caseload data & reports analysis	24	54	40	8	14	26	2.53
26. Community outreach activities	31	51	25	5	10	44	2.28

Please check the boxes of the THREE MAIN impediments to keeping up with your case-related work aspects:	Responses	
Inadequate staffing/budget to meet workload demands.	45.78%	76
Unrealistic judicial expectations/requirements.	17.47%	29
Technological difficulties (e.g., ICIS or email system being down; online detention screening tool problems).	36.75%	61
Other agencies that are slow in providing necessary information.	21.08%	35
Unpredictable nature of the job; dealing with emergency/crisis situations.	67.47%	112
Paperwork demands related to TOPS, NYTD, DHS, etc.	49.40%	82
Lack of client/family cooperation/compliance (no shows, cancelled, appointments, failure to provide requested information, etc.).	31.33%	52
Rescheduling and delaying court hearings complicate scheduling of work time.	5.42%	9
Challenges in coordinating efforts among multiple agencies (e.g., court, JCS, DHS, CFSR, law enforcement) and meeting their standards.	14.46%	24
	Answered	166

Please provide any additional information regarding issues that impact your ability to complete your work in a timely and high-quality manner:

1. We were impacted with Computer issues with data entry for nearly 3 days due to the fact that our case management system was down. This created more work and put me behind in trying to do my job in a timely fashion. We had Court hearings and deadlines during the computer outage, which created more work as we had to make copies of reports from files for the Judges and Attorneys to use during Court. There were several days that I came to work early and stayed late to try and get caught up. We depend on getting reports from other agencies, namely law enforcement, etc. to prepare our documents for detention hearings in a timely fashion; however, in the out counties of our district we are usually waiting on reports before we can type up the documents we need for Court prior to a hearing. Depending on the day, we may have very little time to type up the proposed orders we need to e-file for a court hearing. I do the clerical and data entry for six counties in our district which can be very be very stressful from time to time. As a state employee for JCS for 44 years, I continue trying to keep up with the changes and challenges that Juvenile Court provides day to day, and maintain our record information as efficiently as possible.
2. The Judicial budget cuts such as: transportation cuts, cuts in the annual training, cuts in services for our youth in our local communities, cuts in supplies, and the overall uncertainty that our youth are being provided with the high quality treatment they are needing impact our ability to work in a timely and high quality manner.
3. It is difficult to keep up with all the demands of computer entry data. It sometimes feels like all I ever do is computer work. Impacts on time with kids. Too many requirements for entries on cases. It gets overwhelming, especially when you get behind in your day to day entries. (Sometimes minute to minute entries). Another issue is all the training that has been thrown at us in the last 2 years. We are told one thing is the best way to work with kids, then another training comes along that is the "best" & so forth. Hard to keep up with all the changes and what we're supposed to do & not do.

The lack of appropriate budget & staff is also a concern. Lack of appropriate staffing is a huge concern. Caseloads are going up & we need more JCO's and tech staff. I also feel the procurement situation is keeping us from putting kids in better facilities than what is available to us in our district. We should be able to choose the program that best suits the child's needs instead of having to place only in the programs in our districts, when these placements are known to not be the best. Most JCO's have done this job long enough they know what facilities are best suited for clients. A very big concern for me is the closing of the Girl's State Training School. I work with girls and have had several that would have qualified for that program as have other JCO's. I have also heard from other JCO's that a Girl's State Training School is needed. We have girls that need a locked facility. The former Girl's State Training School was a good program for my clients that were sent there. With girls, it often takes up to 3 months before they feel comfortable enough to

trust an adult & begin to work the program. One problem often leads into another problem and so on. Girls take time to heal and need that time. Some of these girls are assaultive & aggressive and runaway frequently from unlocked facilities. If there could be another Girl's State Training School or a locked facility somewhere for girls, then I feel we would be treating them fairly. Right now, we are told to look outside the State of Iowa for girls who would qualify for the training school. This is unfair and biased as there is an in state training school for boys.

More money for community based programming would also be welcome. Kids coming back home from placement need all the support they can get as do kids in the community already on probation. Money for programs like tracking, diversion, day treatment programs, girl's groups, etc. would be nice.

Holding parents more accountable would be nice as well. We are getting younger offenders who often don't understand or don't care what they've done. This holds true for some of our older clients as well. The parents aren't held accountable though. I think the parents of delinquent kids need to court ordered to attend a parenting class & must complete it. If not, they can be found in contempt. Perhaps more parents would "step up to the plate" so to speak, and start being a parent in their child's life. We ask the child to make changes, but don't ask the parents/guardians to make changes. How can one be successful without the other being successful or changing as well?

In summary, too many requirements for data entry work, budget cuts, not having enough staff, limiting our ability to place kids in appropriate programs, not having a locked facility for girls, not having parents court ordered to parenting classes & not having more money for community based programming all figure in to needing to make changes in budgeting and out job. I want to spend more time with my kids on probation but it's hard to do with all the restraints & above stated concerns. Thank you.

4. If this study was done 2 months before, my answers would have been very different. Our caseloads change can change dramatically increasing/decreasing travel time, court time, report writing time and paperwork time.
5. Rural areas and drive time. There are times we could meet with some high-risk clients but are restricted due to the mileage and budget concerns. Also, there is an issue with driving to rural areas where families do not show up or forget and need to reschedule. This is a timely matter and a constant battle to keep up with the time frame requirements imposed by JCS. The requirement to do EPICS with students in placement is a bad idea. EPICS is Effective Practices in Community Supervision. When students are placed out of the home in residential treatment, they are no longer in the community for supervision. Agencies are getting paid to provide these services to rehabilitate the individual. Our time would be better served doing EPICS with those clients still in the communities. It could be more effective to have some hearings over the phone, ICN or other means to save on unnecessary travel time for the student, families, and court system employees. I believe

the changes to the placement system have created more problems and less effective work from when the students was placed in the most appropriate placement as stated in the code of Iowa. By requiring the nearest placement, quality of service is jeopardized and creates more work for the JCO instead of using a high quality, highly qualified program, even if it was further from home for the student. Most families would rather have their child get the appropriate level of care from an agency with a proven track record. Thank you for soliciting feedback from the JCO's.

6. Budget constraints especially cuts in mileage. Impacts seeing children in placement, the most high-risk group.
7. At this point, I feel I'm able to prioritize the duties of being a supervisor and meet the majority of expectations the Judicial Branch has of the position. As with any profession, there are busy weeks and there are slower weeks. Of major concern, there will be a JCO retiring in the near future and that will add additional case management responsibilities to multiple JCOs as the position won't be filled due to the budget. I'll also be adding a juvenile caseload of an additional county (very rural) to my supervisor responsibilities. We will all be doing more with less. This has the potential to make a significant impact on the quality of work JCS prides itself on.
8. All of the paperwork.
9. Our office is down 4 positions. I consistently find myself doing tasks that aren't standard JCO responsibilities. Whether it be answering phones, doors, technical issues, assisting other JCOs with all the new systems/requirements, etc. Regularly new tasks are being added as far as new forms, new DHS requirements. Outside of these, the nature of our job adds additional workload issues when there are daily instances of crisis situations, disgruntled parents, no-shows, on-call issues, and coordinating between multiple agencies/individuals. Because of our low numbers I'm finding that office coverage is taking precedent and because I work in two counties outside of my domicile I feel that my face to face visits in those counties, and my time in those communities repeatedly take a huge hit. I bring my work cell/laptop home nightly in case I have even a spare 30 minutes to work on cases, enter chronos, check in with clients/parents. Some of this is to be expected due to the nature of our job and the stability of the clients on our caseload at any given time, however I feel that since certain tasks/expectations have been added and our staff numbers have continued to decline- this has been demanding our time and pulling us away from meaningful, regular contacts with our clients and families. Lastly, the new mileage restrictions make it difficult to see our kids in placement. We are encouraged to carpool and only send one vehicle to each placement per month. While this is fiscally responsible, it hinders JCOs abilities to make it every month to see their own clients, to be present during crisis situations that pop up, and to be able to attend on campus staffings, etc.
10. In 2017, I lost two full-time JCO positions and 1 Specialist position to retirements, without any staff replacement. Our last only clerical position will retire in April 2018. I am very concerned that without the permission to replace retirees, our office will become less than

full-time and we will be unable to meet even the most minimal requirements for Juvenile Court Services.

11. High caseloads and insufficient staff to address case load and supervise districts lacking a supervisor and a JCO.
12. The expectation of how often we are to see our clients depending on their risk level and the amount of travel time that includes. Also kids that are in an out of home placement, there are times when an entire day is spent traveling to see a youth.
13. This survey does not match the job responsibilities for a JCS Specialist. It is geared toward JCO responsibilities.
14. The enforcement of the EPICS program has been a complete detriment to how I perform my job as a Juvenile Court Officer. I don't stand alone with this opinion. EPICS as a tool to be used at an Officers discretion would be fine. However, to enforce a program that can't be statistically measured is a complete shame. It has changed the entire environment and in my opinion has destroyed each officer's ability to make professional decisions with individual cases. It's unfortunate that a select few, whom are not in the field, make all of these decisions.
15. Techs have retired, but not replaced. The additional work added can be very overwhelming on days. My work does get done, but I usually have to work through the lunch hours to get it done.
16. I have a work cell phone that doesn't work in my office. This does not assist me with communicating with my clients and families.
17. Too much computer time with entries that rarely get read and not enough face time with clients. Never get caught up.
18. Computer issues at times. Travel between counties I cover can eat up client face to face time or shortens sessions to accommodate travel time etc.
19. The job of rural JCO's is much different than suburban JCO's having done both. You are called in to do many jobs that really do not fit the job description but are necessary to the community. You also have to be much more creative to get the job done. We also work very hard to keep low risk kids out of the system even though in the in the suburban areas they avoid these cases. Poverty is a major problem with few resources.
20. We have a rigorous expectation of work hours of 8-4:30 with little consideration for the needs of our clients/families outside those hours. More flexibility in scheduling to meet our clients/families' needs would increase our efficiency. Flex-time vs. unpaid overtime would increase job satisfaction also.
21. Given we are down a JCO (which is not being replaced) and two CIOs who were out on maternity leave really impacted the INTAKE UNIT. We currently use EPICS on moderate/high youth and having to see high youth twice a month is difficult. I also believe we have had more no shows for intake appointments since we moved into the new building as parking is an issue.
22. I get my job done fine as work fluctuates. Days are never the same. It would help if I didn't have to log-in to ICIS every time I turn around.
23. Driving also takes up a lot of time.

24. DHS has a lot of requirements (paperwork) that seems unnecessary given our jobs.
25. Travel to see clients in placement on a monthly basis, which I truly believe is the best to meet with placement clients on monthly basis. However, this typically requires full days out of the office and no one is in the office to manage day to day items. I hope the impact the amount of square miles being covered in some rural areas is extensive. Including driving to conduct intakes from domicile to covered area being nearly one hour one way to conduct intakes, court hearings, or client contacts. We live in a rural area, which makes it a challenge for some clients to travel to other area counties to meet with JCS. I would consider these as barriers and hope this is being considered when making staffing issues.
26. Our job is an extremely challenging balance of needing to be flexible and responsive on short notice to tamp down or head off crisis and see youth often enough to manage behavior and get early warning of trouble versus administrative requirements that keep JCOs locked to the office. These activities are in direct competition with each other. The DHS/Child Welfare requirements and processes take away from our core mission.
27. Informal caseload is too high.
28. I spend a lot of time on the road traveling to different counties and visiting kids in placement. I feel that people are not logistically covering counties that make sense in reference to their domiciles and where they live. We have people driving 40 miles to cover a county when there is an officer in that county that could cover it.
29. The front desk set up is ghastly. Clearly an afterthought compared to the other public counters in this building.....NO CELL PHONE SERVICE. THERE IS NO EXCUSE.
30. The workload is not stable. There are months where it is overwhelming and months that are not as busy. One month is difficult to judge a true representation of workload.
31. I'm in a county with little resources and you have to be creative to make things work. Everything takes more time.
32. Since May of this year we have lost 2 full-time JCO's my caseload has doubled as has my coverage area (which is rural area). In addition, we lost a secretary and our specialist who assisted us a great deal. Now our currently and only secretary is retiring in April and we are hearing we will not fill her position...Not only that but our expectations to see kids has increased dramatically and the "new" paperwork and other "tools" has also multiplied in the last year. There is rarely any time to catch up or even keep up because we are always dealing with a new crisis that takes priority over all the "pending work"....
33. Complex, high risk cases involving specialized populations require additional time and effort.
34. The time we have to commit to being in front of a computer doing things like TOPS, reports, and JVIS notes reduces the time we are able to work in the office or in the community with the high-risk youth, whom we are supposed to be doing EPICS with twice a month, and generally takes away from the time we have with youth in the community or in office.
35. I understand that EDMS is supposed to be paperless, but with JCS not having tablets they still have to use their paper files, so we still print out the orders. To pull orders off of EDMS there are about 7 clicks to each order. Could there be a way to shorten how many

- times you have to click into the documents to make them close out on EDMS. It is pretty time consuming doing this, example if you get 70 orders in a day to pull off, you have to click 490 times to print those orders off, it seems like this is excessive. Thanks for listening.
36. Formalized EPICS process is not necessary. Concept is what we do already. TOP is a DHS program and they should do it. DST is worthless because we have the Code of Iowa. Risk assessment is too long and any JCO with sense does not need a risk assessment to direct what services are needed for a young person. It is a waste of time and tax supported funding. Common sense needs to prevail more in decisions and not justify elitist ideas that come from the world of academia.
 37. In the rural areas, our office is easily accessible to the public and individuals are more likely to drop in to ask questions regarding at-risk youth who are not referred to JCS. I also field a lot of calls from law enforcement and parents about services for their kids who have yet to be referred to JCS. I would also say that in a rural office, there are dynamics that may need to be considered such as; no janitor (we clean and take out our own trash), mail is not delivered so we pick up the mail at the post office, we shovel snow from in front of the door during winter, we maintain the state car and make sure oil is changed, just to name a few. They are not always big consumers of time, but it is something that is in addition to standard JCO work that we face in a rural office. It's maybe difficult to get a clear picture of all the peripheral tasks, but having been in both the urban setting and the rural, there is significant differences between the two office as it relates to some of these things. Hope that is helpful!
 38. I would like to have more time to meet face to face w/high risk offenders. Paperwork takes a lot of my time.
 39. The direction our court system is taking is toward social work, instead of probation, which is not what court officers are trained to do. There is some liability on our parts taking on tasks (EPICS) that were never meant to be done by probation departments. This causes anxiety and frustration in an already difficult job. Also, there are safety concerns while on the job, now more than ever. As a JCO, I no longer feel safe at my job, especially doing home visits.
 40. Each day is a new day with this job. However, one high-risk formal case, if there are a lot of problems -- such as having a hard time locating an out-of-home placement for a juvenile, can take most of the week trying to figure all of this out. Also, having to go through DHS now, staffing's with them to get approval, contacting providers, sending info, making contact w/ the parents and the court system plus keeping the JCS supervisor up to date of what is going. These types of cases can really use up your week. Your other cases have to take be 2nd and if there are other emergencies you have to attend this as well. So it is very hard to figure out at times how much time we put into each case because each juvenile case is different and depending on the court cases it can be demanding.
 41. At times, it feels that it is one or the other, meaning you either get your work done within the timelines the leadership team establishes, or you give high-quality attention and work to the case, which may take longer than expected or be out of the "normal" of handling things.

42. Lack of leadership from administration in my office and in Court Administration to think ahead to staffing needs. I recently had one Drug Court Case Manager leave due to insufficient compensation. I waited three weeks from the date she left for Court Administration approval to fill her position, and now I have waited almost two additional weeks on my administration at JCS to post the position. Add to this situation the fact that my other Case Manager was involved in a debilitating car accident and will be out of commission for three to five months. All of this means that I am now managing three caseloads of moderate to high-risk youth, and coordinating the Drug Court program by myself with some gracious assistance from fellow JCOs helping with after-hours curfew calls. After offering two different options to administration for contingency planning to adequately cover case supervision, no decisions have been made, and nothing has been put in place. Consequently, I'm surviving. Not completing anything in a "high-quality manner".
43. Technological difficulties, system down or lack of technology to assist in making things flow better.
44. 1) answering the main phone
2) answering the door (receptionist duties)
3) JCO's needing assistance due to emergent/crisis situation
These are the top 3 issues that impede me from doing letters, data entry, etc.
45. I am the placement officer for our district. I travel often and when computers are down, I cannot enter visits, emails and do necessary work which leaves me behind in managing my cases to the best of my ability.

There is a need for additional support for my position so that documentation occurs in a timely manner. There are new interventions and assessments that are specific to DHS youth but not JCS youth where community protection must be addressed. I find that because of this, some of the interventions we are required to do with the youth are ineffective and do not positively impact the youth and are time consuming for the JCO.

46. We have had a number of employees retire and due to the hiring freeze we are unable to fill those positions. As a result, in addition to my current duties, I will be assuming responsibility for the satellite office in Cedar Co. in November. I expect this will impact my ability to adequately address all my responsibilities.
47. Not having cell services is a major impediment with all JCS staff.
48. Supervisor's time is so heavy, it is hard to be able to talk to them to get direction.
49. The amount of documentation required prevents us from being effective. Including this thing I am doing RIGHT NOW. I am not meeting with a child right now. We are so busy going to trainings and going meetings and preparing documentation we don't have time to actually be creative and help families improve their lives.
50. It is difficult to measure what I don't have time to do because priorities trump and the other things simply don't happen because of being spread thin. However, that is our "normal" and it is hard to think outside of just getting it done and moving on to the next thing.

51. Emergencies, after hour detention placements, law enforcement calls. Being on call 24 hours and expecting staff and myself to be responsive. Covering lots of territory resulting in long drives.
52. Constantly having to do the specialist job (while she sits and plays on her phone) or writing lists of things she needs to do in the database instead of her just doing her job!
53. Due to the JCS Office in Polk County having NO CELL PHONE SERVICE - ALL, I repeat ALL JCOs spend a portion of their day going upstairs to retrieve voice messages and make calls. It is not optional to have to go upstairs when kids/parents call on cell phones.
54. Rural JCO's have so much drive time to see our clients. At times were driving 60 miles to see a kid.
55. The services are offered to urban areas to manage high risk offenders not rural areas for families, contacts are accepted from agencies in our district not willing to go to rural counties, there is no tech in this office all office responsibilities, equipment up keep, intake, all levels of service coordination, community outreach, prevention lies with the one JCO there time is spent significantly different with the entire scope of JCS work.
56. The needs of our clients and working with their families seem to be growing increasingly complex and demanding. Gun violence and gang activity in our area have brought safety concerns to an all-time high. Understaffing and paperwork of no benefit to our clients tend to take us from what we are intended to do and to the level that the condition mentioned above warrant.
57. Often, as a Supervisor, my work becomes secondary to the needs of staff and their cases.
58. We have had a major uptick in the last few months in regards to EPICS, Carematch, TOPS, YTDM, etc. Yet we have lost staff. Gaining much more requirements with less and less staff causes obvious stressors.

Appendix D: Iowa JCS Weighted Case Formula for Determining Statewide Need for Juvenile Court Officers

The model presented in Appendix D (next page) shows the detail for how the NCSC calculated the statewide JCO staffing need of 206.9 FTEs. As discussed Section VII, *Juvenile Court Officer Workload Calculation and Resource Needs*. The NCSC multiplied the workload values by the number of new cases in each case status category by judicial district, the sum of which represents the expected annual workload in each district. The NCSC then divides the expected annual workload by the case-related year value to determine the district-specific workload in work minutes. As discussed in the body of this report, while the workload values and the overall need of 206.9 JCO FTE seemed appropriate to the Workload Formula Committee members, the allocation across districts did not. For this reason, the workload formula presented in Appendix E was used to allocate the 209.6 JCO FTEs among the judicial districts.

Notes:

1. Workload Values = Average number of minutes per case spent by JCOs on each case type per year, based on a study of JCOs work-time conducted by the National Center for State Courts during 2017.
2. The "demand" for JCOs is calculated by dividing the *case-specific work minutes* by JCOs, presented in row 18 [which is the sum of multiplying the case weights by the new cases in each district] by the average annual available minutes JCOs have to do case-related work -- which was determined to be 103,200 annual minutes, minus 28,810 minutes of noncase-related work, minus the actual average travel time recorded in the NCSC's 2017 study. Figures 3 and 4 in this report present information on how the NCSC calculated the year value.

Appendix D -- Iowa Weighted Case Formula for Determining the Statewide Need for Juvenile Court Officers

W/O#	Case Status Type	Annual Workload Values [1]	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	STATE
1	Intake/referral	296	505	848	421	484	1,235	404	424	949	5,270
2	Hold open status	53	212	102	218	96	168	166	134	229	1,325
3	Diversion	41	595	141	315	0	785	499	331	0	2,666
4	Interstate compact	1,362	10	3	13	32	16	5	20	7	106
5	Pending adjudication	5,431	13	14	43	12	53	16	27	21	199
6	Informal - unknown risk	251	4	81	41	23	104	17	5	51	326
7	Informal - low risk	345	126	386	171	244	545	80	154	342	2,048
8	Informal - moderate risk	929	60	112	59	35	128	64	51	74	583
9	Informal - high risk	1,332	25	48	26	14	56	30	21	44	264
10	Formal - unknown risk	559	26	54	37	3	69	25	20	27	261
11	Formal - low risk	1,297	35	30	37	23	105	57	41	44	372
12	Formal - moderate risk	2,999	50	33	72	27	150	64	53	64	513
13	Formal - high risk	7,821	104	59	50	36	180	103	67	58	657
14	Formal - sex offender	4,771	17	33	38	21	39	16	16	13	193
15	Waivers/reverse waivers	925	36	38	35	22	52	47	25	68	323
16	Total District Cases		1,818	1,982	1,576	1,072	3,685	1,593	1,389	1,991	15,106
17	[A] Case-Specific Work Minutes (Sum of Wgts x Cases)		1,540,572	1,485,777	1,448,436	912,728	3,390,489	1,579,117	1,296,586	1,517,268	13,170,972
18	[B] District-specific average annual travel per FTE		16,086	10,523	11,597	14,289	8,868	9,643	6,166	10,688	
19	[C] Avg annual mins. avail. for case-work (103.200 - 28.810)		74,390	74,390	74,390	74,390	74,390	74,390	74,390	74,390	
20	[D] Total JCO FTE DEMAND (A/B)		26.4	23.3	23.1	15.2	51.7	24.4	19.0	23.8	206.9
21	[E] Current Auth. JCO FTE		21.0	26.0	24.0	12.0	50.0	24.0	19.0	17.0	193.0
22	[F] # Authorized is this # above (+) or below (-) FTE Demand (D - E)		-5.4	2.7	0.9	-3.2	-1.7	-0.4	0.0	-6.8	-13.9

Note:

Current actual # of JCOs includes 4 intake officers in District 5 paid with DHS funds (45+4). Drug Court employees are also included in budgeted FTE. Districts 2 and 8 have one officer each. District 3 has 3 officers and District 5 has 1 officer, 2 case managers and .64 tech.

Appendix E: Formula for Allocating the Statewide Need for JCO Positions (in Appdx D), Formula for JCS Support Staff, and a Summary of the Overall Statewide Need for JCS Staff

The model on this page (columns A-G) allocates the statewide need for **206.9 FTE JCOs** (Appdx D, row 20) among the judicial districts as follows.

- (1) **Col. A** = Total youth population (age 5-17) in each district in Iowa in 2017; **Col. B** = % of total statewide youth population that resides in each district.
- (2) **Col. C** = Total youth population (age 5-17) in poverty in each district in 2017; **Col. D** = % of state's youth in poverty that resides in each district.
- (3) Determine the number of JCOs needed statewide (**206.9 FTEs**) based on the NCSC's weighted case status type formula in Appendix D, row 20.
- (4) **Col. E**: Allocate **80%** of the 206.9 FTEs (**165.5**) according to the % of the total statewide youth population that resides in the district (col. E, row 9)
- (5) **Col. F**: Allocate **20%** of the 206.9 FTEs (**41.4**) according to the % of the total statewide youth in poverty that resides in the district (col. F, row 9)

		Allocation of 206.9 FTE JCO Positions* (A-G) Compared to Current # of Positions										JCS Support Staff			Summary				
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R
Row #	Dist	2017 Woods & Poole Est: Total # of Kids (5-17) (A/A9)	% of State Kids Pop. (A/A9)	US Census: # of kids in poverty (C/C9)	% of state's kids in poverty (C/C9)	Wgt 80% of JCO formula on % of youth pop. (165.5)* X Col. B	Wgt 20% of JCO formula on % youth poverty (41.4)** X Col. D	Total FTE JCOs Needed per District (E + F)	JCOs: # Current Authorz'd Positions in FY18 Budget	JCOs: Current # is above (+) or below (-) # Needed (H-G)	JCOs: % Difference betw curmt & needed (I / H)	JC Specialists			Chief JCO & Adm Sec Needed	Total # of JCS Staff Needed (G+K+N)	Vacancies (shortage)		Total FTE JCS Staff Shortage [I+M+P+Q]
												# Needed by formula (G/4)	Current # Author-ized	Current # above (+) or below (-) formula (L-K)			2/9/18 JCOs	JC Spec	
1	1	60,923	11.5%	8,280	11.6%	19.1	4.8	23.9	21.0	-2.9	-13.9%	6.0	6.4	0.4	2.0	31.9	-3	-0.6	-6.2
2	2	71,520	13.6%	9,170	12.9%	22.4	5.3	27.8	26.0	-1.8	-6.8%	6.9	7.0	0.1	2.0	36.7	-4	-3	-8.7
3	3	58,288	11.0%	8,167	11.5%	18.3	4.7	23.0	24.0	1.0	4.0%	5.8	5.7	-0.1	2.0	30.8	-2	0	-1.1
4	4	31,200	5.9%	4,978	7.0%	9.8	2.9	12.7	12.0	-0.7	-5.7%	3.2	3.2	0.0	2.0	17.8	0	-0.2	-0.8
5	5	139,474	26.4%	16,942	23.8%	43.8	9.8	53.6	50.0	-3.6	-7.2%	13.4	13.6	0.2	2.0	69.0	-4	0	-7.4
6	6	71,988	13.6%	8,000	11.2%	22.6	4.6	27.2	24.0	-3.2	-13.5%	6.8	6.6	-0.2	2.0	36.0	-1	-3.6	-8.0
7	7	52,299	9.9%	7,875	11.1%	16.4	4.6	21.0	19.0	-2.0	-10.4%	5.2	5.0	-0.2	2.0	28.2	-2	-1	-5.2
8	8	41,869	7.9%	7,841	11.0%	13.1	4.6	17.7	17.0	-0.7	-4.1%	4.4	5.0	0.6	2.0	24.1	-2	-1	-3.1
9	All	527,561	100%	71,253	100%	165.5	41.4	206.9	193.0	-13.9	-7%	51.7	52.5	0.8	16.0	274.6	-18	-9.4	-40.5
*Statewide Need for FTE JCOs per 2018 Wght Case Formula (Appdx D, row 20):						206.9	> Allocate 80% (165.5) by % of total youth pop. > Allocate 20% (41.4) by % youth in poverty												